

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

VOL. III.

No. 9.

I.—NONIUS MARCELLUS.

I.

The name of Nonius Marcellus is associated, in the minds of most persons who have thought it worthy of remembrance at all, with grammatical dulness and ignorance. At the same time his work *De Compendiosa Doctrina* is, in its way, of such importance, if only on account of the numerous quotations from ancient Latin authors which it contains, that no student of Latin can afford to ignore it. More than this, it is incontestable that many among the notes of Nonius are of great value in themselves, and many again deserve notice, if not from their intrinsic merit, at least as illustrating a particular phase of philological criticism among the ancients. But it is not only in detail that the *De Compendiosa Doctrina* deserves attention and requires a correct appreciation. Nonius occupies an important position, not only in the history of Latin grammar and criticism, but in that of Latin literature, so far at least as his work can be shown to stand in organic connection with the literary tendencies of the age in which he lived. It is mainly in this light that I propose, in the following remarks, to consider the work which bears his name.

The flourishing province of Africa, an account of which and of its organization is given by Mommsen at the beginning of the eighth volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum*, contributed, from the end of the first century A. D. and onwards, many names of mark

to the history of Roman literature. Juvenal calls it in his time¹ *nutricula causidicorum*; had he lived two centuries later he might have called it the nurse of professors. It is true that Africa cannot rival Spain in the lustre of her literary renown; she can show no Seneca, or Martial, or Lucan, or Quintilian. To have accomplished as much as this would have been impossible to writers so far removed, in point of time, from the age of the republic and the early empire. But, to say nothing of the Christian authors, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius and Augustine, Africa produced several men eminent, as eminence went in that age, in science and the higher philological criticism. Caelius Aurelianus, the writer on medicine, was, like Arnobius, a native of Sicca; Fronto, the tutor of Marcus Aurelius, came from Cirta, the scholar and poet Sulpicius Apollinaris from Carthage, Apuleius, the able sophist and devoted student, from Madaura, and Nonius Marcellus from Thubursicum in Numidia. Thus the study of the ancient Roman literature was early domesticated in the province of Africa.

Of Nonius himself we know no more than what is told us by the title of his book and by an inscription found at Thubursicum. The title of the book is *Nonii Marcelli Peripatetici Thubursicensis De Compendiosa Doctrina ad Filium*. The work then is educational, and intended by its author for the benefit of his son, like the metrical treatise of Terentianus Maurus, and the commentary of Tiberius Claudius Donatus on the Aeneid. From the addition *Peripatetici* it would appear that Nonius was a pronounced Peripatetic, just as Apuleius of Madaura in the second century was a pronounced Platonist. The word *Thubursicensis* brings us to the inscription found at Thubursicum, and published first by Renier and recently by Wilmanns and Mommsen in the eighth volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (No. 4878): *Beatissimo sa[eculo d. n.] Constantini Ma[ximi] semper Aug. et [Crispi] et Constantin[i] nobb. Caess.] plateam veterem [omni] lapide spoliata[m] Nonius Marcellus Herculus so[lide] constravit [et ther]mas et ce[tera rui]na dilap[sae aedificia]*. The stone belongs then to the year 323 A. D., and Mommsen very naturally identifies Nonius Marcellus Herculus with Nonius the scholar. If we may rest content with a strong probability, we may infer that Nonius, besides being a scholar and the professed adherent of a philosophical school, was a man of some wealth and social standing in his own city. His assumption of the title *Peripateticus* justifies us in con-

¹ 7. 149.

cluding further that he was not a Christian; the contents of his book prove that he was an eager student of ancient and classical Latin. He may fairly therefore be classed, for literary purposes, among the non-Christian scholars and antiquarians of the fourth and fifth centuries; with Servius the commentator on Vergil, Macrobius, and the elder Symmachus.

As I have elsewhere¹ observed, the work of Nonius contains only a very few quotations from any author later than the Augustan age. The exceptions to this general rule only tend to prove it, for one of the later citations is from Apuleius, and the others are from Septimius Serenus, both Africans, and both almost pedantic students of antiquity. It is worth while to trace, so far as is possible, the course of this curious reaction in favor of the past, which is a notable phenomenon in the history of the later Latin literature. Suetonius tells us² that the memory of the ancient writers had perished at Rome by the middle of the first century A. D., though it still survived in the provinces. This fact may have been in great measure due to the success of the Augustan writers, Vergil, Horace, Livy, and Ovid, in the field of literature, and still more in that of education, where Vergil and Horace soon drove out the older poets from the curriculum of study. But a reaction set in during the latter half of the first century, which was favored partly by the tendencies of literary taste, and partly also by the growth of the science of grammar and criticism. Of the literary tendency we have a suggestive record in the *Dialogus de Oratoribus* of Tacitus, which shews that a large party among the *litterati* of Italy preferred the ancients, meaning by them Cicero, Caesar, Lucretius and their contemporaries, to the Augustan authors. The way in which Tacitus speaks of the orators of the Ciceronian age confirms the already quoted statement of Suetonius. *Nescio an venerint in manus vestras haec vetera, quae in antiquariorum bybliotheçis adhuc manent, ac cum maxime a Muciano colliguntur, ac iam undecim, ut opinor, Actorum libris et tribus Epistularum composita et edita sunt.*³ It is clearly implied that the works of the ancient orators had, until quite recently, lain comparatively neglected in the libraries of the *antiquarii* or lovers of antiquity. Among these apparently we must reckon Mucianus, the able and accomplished, but profligate friend of Vespasian. These speeches were now, however, being edited in an accessible form, a fact which

¹ "Verrius Flaccus," II, p. 9.

² De Illustribus Grammaticis, 24.

³ Dialogus 37.

seems to indicate the existence of a revived interest in them in literary circles.

The style of the *Dialogus* of Tacitus, written about 80 A. D., shews that he at that time belonged to the antiquarian party; and the same literary tradition was continued by Quintilian. Meanwhile the critical study of ancient texts was started and considerably furthered by an elder contemporary of Tacitus, M. Valerius Probus of Berytus in Syria, who, if Jerome may be trusted, had won a reputation in Rome as a scholar at about the time when Tacitus was born.¹ The main results of his work were revised texts of ancient writers, notably of Terence, Lucretius, Vergil and Horace,² with commentaries on some of them, and a *Silva Observationum Sermonis Antiqui*, or collection of observations on ancient usage, a work which, from its title, we may infer to have been of a miscellaneous character.

By the end of the first century A. D. the critical study of the ancient authors had fairly begun. Grammar and orthography were treated by Flavius Caper and Velius Longus in the age of Trajan, and it must have been during the same period that Caesellius Vindex composed his great work entitled *Stromateus* or *Lectiones Antiquae*. This work, of which I shall have more to say below, must, if we may trust its title, have dealt mainly, if not entirely, with questions affecting the language of the *antiqui*, or Latin writers from Naevius to Vergil. Caesellius was succeeded and criticized by Terentius Scaurus, of whose treatise on orthography some considerable fragments are preserved. The coincidences between the contents of these fragments and the early chapters of the *Institutio Oratoria*, in which Quintilian touches upon questions of grammar, are so striking that it is impossible to resist the conclusion that both writers are borrowing from the same work or works, which must of course have been at least as old as the first century.

It is probably to Probus, Caesellius Vindex, Terentius Scaurus, Nisus, and Sulpicius Apollinaris, to whom we should perhaps add Varro and Nigidius Figulus, and certainly Verrius Flaccus, that Aulus Gellius is mainly indebted for the fragments of Latin criticism and erudition around which, in the *Noctes Atticae*, he has endeavored to throw the attraction of popular and literary form. The

¹ Jerome to A. D. 56.

² Suetonius *De Viris Illustribus*, p. 138 (Reifferscheid).

Noctes Atticae of Aulus Gellius, whose *floruit* is usually assigned to the years 120-170 A. D. or thereabouts, present us with the first existing example of a new form of literature. Like Fronto, the tutor of Marcus Aurelius, Gellius is devoted to the study of the *antiqui*. But the kind of study which he gives to them is very different from the rational interest and industry displayed by Probus on the one hand, and Tacitus on the other, in the age of Vespasian. The taste of Gellius is the taste of the antiquarian, whose eye rests exclusively on works of a certain period. I doubt for instance whether there is a single quotation in Gellius from Lucan, Martial, Statius, Tacitus, or Juvenal. He cites indeed some of his own contemporaries, but with this exception I think that Vergil and Horace are the latest authors whom he quotes. His own style too is marked by an affectation of archaism in language, an intentional employment of words many of which perhaps he had only learned to understand from the works of commentators and grammarians. A similar tendency may be perceived in the writings of a far abler and probably more genuinely learned man than Gellius, Lucius Apuleius of Madaura in Numidia. Apuleius, a contemporary of Gellius, is in every point of view a very striking representative of his age. It is the province of the historian to draw the moral from the vivid pictures of life and manners presented in the *Metamorphoses* and the *De Magia*. But these works also hold a peculiar position in the field of literature. The style of Apuleius, as well as his numerous historical allusions, would, even if we had not his own express testimony in the same direction, betray the fact that he had spent much time and labor, *aerumnabilis labor*¹ as he says himself, on mastering Roman antiquities and literature. It is not too much to say that no one can gain a thorough command of the material necessary for the study of ancient Latin without an intimate acquaintance with Apuleius, whose language has preserved in a living connection many words of whose existence and meaning we should otherwise perhaps have been advertised mainly through the writings of lexicographers and grammarians. His style is a curious monument of great originality and force struggling with a language which has lost half its life and significance.

It is probably a mistake to speak of the manner of Apuleius as peculiarly African. His studies of Latin were, as he himself tells us, carried on mainly at Rome and without a master; what there-

¹ Met. I, I.

fore is strained, artificial and archaic in his style is probably due simply to the intimacy which he acquired with the early writers of Italy. Not that these considerations will explain the whole phenomenon. While much of the language of Apuleius is based on antiquarian study, there is no doubt also a considerable part which represents the living popular Latin current in Africa in his time. It is interesting in this connection to compare his style with that of Tertullian, who was about a generation younger. Tertullian uses many words which are unknown to the classical Latin of Italy; but with all his rhetorical training and bias, and his love of point and antithesis, his style, compared with that of Apuleius, may almost be called popular. The difference between the labored antiquarianism of the one writer and the comparative directness and simplicity of the other, is the measure of the difference between the Pagan scholar and philosopher, and the Christian advocate.

For we are now arrived at a point where the presentiment of a great social and religious revolution is beginning to make itself felt in the reading and cultivated society of the Roman empire. The middle and the latter half of the second century is the time at which the controversy between the old and the new religions first begins openly to divide the world of letters, as well as the lower orders of the people. On the one side appear the works of Justin and Minucius Felix, on the other those of Lucian and Apuleius. The illustrious scholar Jacob Bernays, whose recent death is an irreparable loss to letters, has in various works, each of which is in its way a monument not only of learning but of art and historical imagination, helped us by clear, massive and sympathetic drawing to form vivid pictures of several scenes in the great historical drama. The social and moral conflict, parts of which he has described with the hand of a master, extended into the world of antiquarianism and of study. The same passion for a dying past which in the fourth century led Julian to throw himself, in defence of a hopeless religion, into violent opposition to the pronounced tendencies of the age, helped to inspire the scholars of the second, third and fourth centuries to study the history, antiquities, and early literature of the great empire to which they owed all the material advantages of their existence. The abler and educated advocates of Christianity, however, some of whom were converts, and had been familiar with the inside of the Pagan position, knew how to draw their advantage from their knowledge

of antiquity. While the Pagan *litterati* continued, as if by way of passive protest, simply to collect and to con over the relics of the flourishing age of Roman literature, politics and religion, the Christians, who cared comparatively little for literature and politics, destroyed the Pagan religion with the weapons offered them by the Pagan philosophy. The study of Cicero, Varro, and Verrius Flaccus was a double-edged sword, which could be turned at pleasure to the advantage or disadvantage of the polytheistic system.

Readers of Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and Arnobius will need no confirmation of this statement. But it is necessary for our present purpose to dwell for a moment on the work of Arnobius *Adversus Nationes*. Its author, whose Christianity is tempered by a curious mixture of toleration for the religion which he has abandoned, seems, like Apuleius, to have given special attention to the classical literature of Italy. His language, abounding in words taken from the ancient comedy, satire and poetry, must, like that of Apuleius, have been influenced by conscious archaism. It is no mere product of popular Latin preserved in the colonies of Africa. Arnobius has learned to know and to treat with curious and misplaced contempt many of the chief writers of the better ages of Rome, whose works are now lost. And here it is that we come at length into contact with Nonius, who, if we may trust the inscription already quoted, must have been a contemporary, as we know him to have been a countryman, of Arnobius. We have seen that the treatise of Nonius *De Compendiosa Doctrina* was probably intended for educational purposes, consisting as it does of notes on various points of grammar, lexicography and antiquities. Like the *Noctes Atticae* of Gellius, from which much of it has (erroneously as I think) been supposed to be borrowed, it is stamped with the character of pedantic antiquarianism. The range of its quotations would lead us to suppose that Nonius thought no writer worth study who lived later than the Augustan age. In this point he out-Herods some even of the scholars of the second century, who do not object to quote Lucan, Persius, and Juvenal. Taken together with the fact that Christianity is persistently ignored throughout the book, and that Nonius styles himself a Peripatetic, I think that this phenomenon justifies us in classing the work of Nonius as a product of the conservative, or I should rather say, reactionary Roman feeling which meets us again in Macrobius.

The curious contrast between the judgment shown by Nonius in his choice of authors, and his want of judgment in dealing with

them, has made him the butt of scholars, who have not, so far as I know, been at the pains to examine fully the circumstances under which his book was in all probability written. It must be remembered in the first place that the text of the *De Compendiosa Doctrina* has come down to us in a very mutilated condition. This is a fact that he who runs may read. It is not merely that many glosses are lost, but that many others have been confused, mutilated and interpolated, in a way which, unless fortune should make us a present of a better manuscript recension than any now existing, will probably make a true understanding of the whole work impossible. Making all allowances, however, for this external drawback, it cannot be denied that the book contains statements which are inconceivably repugnant to common sense. Here, however, we are brought into contact with a curious phenomenon in the history of ancient Latin scholarship. Whether from want of a true method, or from some other cause or causes, the old Italian learning seemed to lose every element of progress after the first or early second centuries after Christ. The grammarians and scholars of the second century seem to have added nothing at once new and true to the mass of knowledge accumulated in the period extending from the Augustan age to the reign of Hadrian. The material of the older Latin language was all before them, but in common with all the writers of Greco-Roman antiquity, they were ignorant of those principles of investigation which give life to the past by showing its organic connection with the present. The Latin language was changing, the old literature was passing out of the field of living interest, but as far as scientific investigation was concerned they did not know how to take advantage of the fact. There was no alternative; as science could not gain, it lost. Its representatives did nothing but repeat, over and over again, in different forms and applications, the registers made by older scholars, registers which the changes going on in their own time only prevented them from reading aright. Hence even in the scholarship of the age of the Antonines, as represented by Julius Romanus, Fronto, and Aulus Gellius, we are conscious of shallowness and want of insight, just as in the style of the two last-named authors we are struck by affectation, want of purpose, want of character. Both faults arise from a false attitude with regard to the past.

Of Nonius then, attempting as he did at the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century to take up a position which could

not be naturally maintained even at the end of the second, what could be expected but the appearance of incapacity? No improvement had been effected in scientific method, but time had gone on and continued its changes, so that Nonius was at a greater distance from the object of his study than Gellius. It can hardly be surprising then that when he ventures to add a remark of his own to the notes which he is transcribing from older scholars, he should reveal the inherent weakness of his position. Scholars who have been allowed a better reputation in the world of letters, respectable commentators such as Aelius Donatus and Servius, were guilty in like manner and for the same reason of blunders which would otherwise be incredible.

Having said so much with regard to the position of the work of Nonius in the literary history of its time, let us proceed to describe it, and to discuss the question of the authorities whom he consulted or from whom he transcribed.

As the *De Compendiosa Doctrina* has come down to us, it is arranged in twenty books, of one of which the title alone remains. Of the last or twentieth book only a few notes have survived in our existing manuscripts, and these should again be divided into two separate sets or sections, one of which should be entitled *De Propinquitate*, and the other *De Cognominibus*. Taking the work as we have it, we may classify its various books according to their subjects as follows:

1. The lexicographical books, including I (*De proprietate sermonum*), II (*De honestis et nove veterum dictis*), IV (*De varia significatione sermonum*), V (*De differentia similium significationum*), VI (*De impropriis*), and much of XII (*De doctorum indagine*).

2. The grammatical books: III (*De indiscretis generibus*), VII (*De contrariis generibus verborum*), VIII (*De mutata declinatione*), IX (*De numeris et casibus*), X (*De mutatis coniugationibus*), XI (*De indiscretis adverbis*), and some of XII (*De doctorum indagine*).

3. The antiquarian books, namely XIII-XX, (*De genere navigiorum, vestimentorum, vasorum vel poculorum, calciamentorum, De colore vestimentorum, De genere ciborum et potuum, De genere armorum, De propinquitate*).

The method on which we must chiefly rely for discovering the authorities followed by Nonius in the various sections of his work is that of comparing, so far as is possible, his notes with those of

commentators and other lexicographers and grammarians. Nonius himself gives us no hint whatever to guide us in the investigation; but a great number of his observations are found in the works of other writers before and after him, sometimes with the names of the scholars to whom they are ultimately to be referred. Thus by a comparison of the grammatical books of Nonius with the corresponding sections of Charisius and Priscian, it may be shown, almost with certainty, that he is largely, if not entirely indebted to Probus, Caper, and Pliny, or at least to works directly dependent upon the writings of these scholars. This part of the subject I have already discussed in the essays prefixed to the first volume of Conington's *Virgil* (4th edition), and may therefore pass on to the subject of the lexicographical and antiquarian books.

The first book, *De Proprietate Sermonum*, or on the meaning of words, is strictly lexicographical. Its arrangement as we now have it defies any consistent theory, and nothing is left for us therefore but to state the facts. The first point which has been noticed by all scholars who have recently dealt with the question, is that this book consists of words arranged on the whole in series each of which is distinguished by having a quotation or quotations from some one author placed at the head of the rest. Thus in the series extending from *hostimentum* (p. 4) to *examussim* (p. 9) every note begins with a citation from Plautus. Besides this it is also to be noticed that in each series, as a rule, the works of the author whose name stands at the head of each note are quoted in some intelligible order. In a Plautine series, for instance, the plays of Plautus are quoted in alphabetical order, in a Lucilian series the books of Lucilius are quoted in numerical order.

I have shown in my first essay on Verrius Flaccus that this method of arrangement is not peculiar to Nonius, but is found also in Varro *De Lingua Latina*, in Verrius Flaccus, in Julius Romanus, and in Macrobius.

But there are also signs of a rough alphabetical arrangement in many of the sets of words treated in this book. These alphabetical series sometimes coincide exactly with the series according to authors, sometimes they are included in them, sometimes they cross them. Instances of the two series exactly coinciding are to be found p. 20, *clepo corporo circus medicina* (Accius); p. 30, *antes camera dirus exordium inops* (Vergil); of one series included in the other p. 6, *calvitur frigere (de)floccare (de)pexum sartor sentina tricae*, which are included

in a Plautine series ; p. 18, *centuriatim rumen rudus rutrum tenebrio trua (e)vannare vafrum*, which are included in a series from Pomponius ; of one series being crossed by another p. 38, *combibo capital clandestino idiotas expirare eliminare incoxare*, where the end of a Lucilian series is continued by one from Pomponius. On p. 39 in an alphabetical series, *ordior pilare popolare rabere supersedere tintinnire verminari*, the arrangement according to authors is given up altogether.

The second book, *De Honestis et Nove Veterum Dictis*, or on words used by the ancients either in a good sense or in an unusual manner, differs both in form and substance from the first. It observes the method of arrangement according to authors, but this is made also to fit in with a strictly alphabetical order. And its purport is not merely to explain the meaning of words, but to point out peculiarities in ancient usage and differences between ancient and modern form. While for instance on p. 74 we have a purely explanatory note on the word *averruncare*, we have notes on the same page explaining that *apisci* was used by Lucilius for *adipisci* and *accepso* by Pacuvius for *accepero*. It should further be remarked that the number of quotations given under each word is as a general rule much smaller than in the first book, though some words are very fully illustrated.

The fourth book, *De Varia Significatione Sermonum*, or on the different meanings which may be attached to the same words, differs again from both the first and the third. In its alphabetical arrangement it resembles the latter, but it differs from both in the immense number of quotations from Vergil which it contains. A verse of Vergil's is constantly found at the head of each article, and if not at the head, is almost certain to occur somewhere in it. In the first book on the contrary the quotations from Vergil are comparatively rare in proportion to the rest, and in the second very rare indeed. Further, the object of the fourth book is to set out in detail the various meanings which the same word may have. As this is generally done with great fullness and a great number of instances, it follows that the number of words treated in each section is comparatively small. Even so, however, the fourth book contains nearly two hundred pages, or not much less than a third part of the whole treatise.

The fifth book, *De Differentia Similium Significationum*, or on synonymes, forms the natural complement to the fourth. It is not arranged alphabetically, but (on the whole) according to authors.

As in the fourth book, Vergil is largely quoted. Precisely the same remarks apply to the sixth book, *De Impropriis*, or on metaphorical expressions.

The twelfth book, *De Doctorum Indagine*, is a mere miscellany of remarks on grammar and lexicography, in which it is difficult to discover any principle, even that of arrangement according to authors not being strictly adhered to, though there are in several instances traces of it.

What *data* are there to help us in trying to discover the authorities followed by Nonius in this part of his work?

I need not recapitulate the arguments by which in my second essay on Verrius Flaccus I endeavored to show that Nonius did not borrow from Aulus Gellius. But it is necessary to say a word on the hypothesis which finds favor with most scholars who have recently treated the subject, that Nonius had before him commentaries on the authors whom he quotes, and that his work is a series of extracts from these commentaries thrown together by him into loose order. The main support of this theory is the arrangement according to authors which meets us so often in Nonius. I have tried in speaking of Verrius Flaccus to show that Nonius might easily have found this arrangement existing in the works on grammar and lexicography which he would be likely to consult, and therefore that taken by itself the fact in question proves little or nothing. But again, if Nonius was merely making excerpts from commentaries, we should have expected one of two results. Either the whole lexicographical part of his work would have been a mere miscellany in which there would have been no sign of cohesion beyond the fact that the same authors were quoted on the same series of pages, or some other and uniform method of arrangement would have been adopted. But what as a fact do we find? That we have five books of a lexicographic character, three of which (4, 5 and 6) seem to stand in a logical relation to one another, while the other two are written for purposes quite distinct indeed and differing from those of the three first mentioned, yet not so distinct but that the same note may be repeated in each in a slightly varying form, and (which is surely important) without any hint of the fact. Such an entire want of homogeneity is surely most easily explained by the supposition that the first and second books are wholly or partially derived from separate manuals or *compendia*, and that a separate work was the source of the fourth, fifth and sixth. This hypothesis agrees very well with what we know of

other ancient works more or less similar to Nonius, as for instance of much in the grammatical treatises both of Charisius and of Priscian. Again, had Nonius really consulted the ancient commentaries, it is difficult to suppose that he could have been guilty of the numerous absurdities which have made his name proverbial among scholars. Another difficulty has occurred to me, on which, however, I do not lay so much stress. In the first and second books several of the series headed by quotations from ancient writers, such as Plautus and Lucilius, are terminated by quotations from Vergil.¹ This fact surely tells against the theory that in these cases at least Nonius was consulting any of the older commentators on the ancient poets. None, for instance, of the known commentators on Plautus, with the exception of Terentius Scaurus, lived late enough to have quoted Vergil; and in the case of Lucilius we know of no regular commentary later than that of Curtius Nicia in the Ciceronian age.

The most natural supposition with regard to Nonius is in my opinion that his authorities are mainly the works of the scholars and antiquarians of the period which extends from the reigns of Nero and Vespasian to those of Trajan and Hadrian. All internal evidence points this way, and there is also some external evidence which, without being decisive, is worth putting together.

We know to a certain extent what writers on Roman antiquities and philology were read or consulted in Africa in the third and fourth centuries. Tertullian (*De Spectaculis* 5) expressly mentions Suetonius as one of his authorities on the subject of games. On civil and religious antiquities it is abundantly clear that Varro must have furnished a great deal of information to Arnobius. But Arnobius shows also that he had paid attention to grammar and philology, and does not leave us altogether in the dark as to the authors whose works were read in his age and country. Taunting² his Pagan adversaries with their uncertainty on matters of grammar, "You do not know," he cries, "whether it is right to say *haec utria* or *hos utres*, *caelus* or *caelum*, *pilleus* or *pilleum*, *crocus* or *crocum*, *fretus* or *fretum*, *pane* or *panis*, *sanguis* or *sanguen*, *candelaber* and *iugulus* or *candelabrum* and *iugulum*, and from this uncertainty in such and similar matters you are not free, although you know by heart all the Epicadi, Caesellii, Verrii, Scauri

¹ *E. g.* p. 6, *exercitum*, Plautus, Lucretius, Afranius, Vergilius. P. 14, *extorris*, Accius, Turpilii, Sallustius, Vergilius; and more might be quoted.

² I, 59.

and Nisi." Here then is distinct evidence that the works, or some of them, of Epicadus, Caesellius, Verrius, Scaurus and Nisus were current among students of Latin philology at the beginning of the fourth century A. D.

Let us see how this fact bears upon the question of the authorities consulted by Nonius. There are some traces of the fact that he and Arnobius were familiar with the same or at least with similar manuals; thus these very words which Arnobius quotes as of doubtful gender are all found (with the exception of *iugulus*) in the third book of Nonius *De Indiscretis Generibus*; and again in the twenty-third chapter of his second book Arnobius, in his rhetorical manner, recites long lists of articles of dress and furniture which remind the reader of the fourteenth and fifteenth books of Nonius. That Arnobius was familiar with the *De Verborum Significatu* of Verrius Flaccus, or at least that he occasionally consulted it, is rendered almost certain by his remarks in 7, 24 on *offa penita, polimina, caro strebula*, and *ruma*,¹ which correspond almost verbally with notes preserved by Festus. Much of the first and of the later books of Nonius is undoubtedly to be referred ultimately to Verrius. Epicadus, a scholar of the Sullan era, is known to have written a work *De Cognominibus*, but there is no certain evidence of this book having been known either to Nonius or Arnobius. Nor can we say whether Nonius was at all indebted to Nisus or Terentius Scaurus, for of Nisus very little remains, and of Scaurus nothing which brings him into relation with Nonius.

Of Caesellius Vindex there is, fortunately, more to be said. He was a scholar of the age of Trajan, and the author of a work called *Lectiones Antiquae* or *Stromateus*. From Charisius (p. 195 Keil) we know that this treatise contained at least fifty *libri*, which, as Julius Romanus informs us (ap. Charis. p. 117), were arranged alphabetically, some letters including more than one *liber*. Caesellius Vindex is quoted by Gellius 2 16 5 on the meaning of the words *postumus* and *longaevus* in Aeneid 6; 3 16 11 on *Morta* in Livius Andronicus; 11 15 2 on the termination *-bundus* in *errabundus, ludibundus* and the like, 20 2 2 on the word *siticines*. Some remarks of Caesellius on points of grammar are preserved by Priscian 1, p. 210, 230, and by Julius Romanus (Charisius, p. 117 and 239).

If these scanty indications warrant us in inferring anything, they would seem to show that the *Lectiones Antiquae* of Caesellius, if

¹ See Festus, pp. 242, 234, 313, 271.

not a lexicographical work, included much lexicographical information together with notes on points of grammar, illustrated, as its title would lead us to expect, from ancient authors. There is no direct evidence that Nonius consulted the work of Caesellius. The first book of Nonius must indeed, I think, be quite independent of it; for the note on *siticines* on p. 54 corresponds exactly with that in Gellius 20 2, and comes apparently from Ateius Capito. There is however a point which brings the second and the eighth books of Nonius into relation with Caesellius. Gellius 11 15 mentions that Caesellius erroneously supposed adjectives in *-bundus*, such as *errabundus*, *ludibundus*, and the like, to be equivalent to present participles. This doctrine, which is also repudiated by Diomedes (p. 402 K.) or his authority, is affirmed five times by Nonius, three times in the second book (pp. 103, 122, 186), and twice in the eight (pp. 491, 509).

Besides the *Lectiones Antiquae* of Caesellius Vindex, the only great work likely to have contained lexicographical matter that we know of as having been compiled subsequently to the *De Verborum Significatu* of Verrius Flaccus was the *Pratum* of Suetonius. This work we know to have been long used as a work of reference on points of antiquities, and there are fair grounds (as I shall endeavor to point out in due time) for supposing that much of the information contained in the latter or antiquarian books of Nonius came either from it or from Verrius Flaccus. Another very important work which undoubtedly contained much information on points of grammar and usage was the *Silva Observationum Sermonis Antiqui* of Valerius Probus. Whether this work contained lexicographical matter as well it is impossible to say; but I suspect that Gellius owed a great deal to it, and it is not impossible that the fourth, fifth and sixth books of Nonius, which evidently are based on the work of a great student of Vergil, are to be traced directly or indirectly to Probus. But however the case may stand with regard to this or that particular work of reference, I have little doubt that the authorities of Nonius are in the main the same as those of Gellius, and therefore, at least, include handbooks based upon the works of Verrius Flaccus, Caesellius Vindex, Probus, and Suetonius. That a number of such handbooks existed in the second century we know from the express testimony of Gellius himself, Praef. 5 foll. *Nam quia variam et miscellam et quasi confusaneam doctrinam conquisiverant, eo titulos quoque ad eam sententiam exquisitissimos indiderunt. Namque alii MUSARUM in-*

*scripserunt, alii SILVARUM, ille πέπλον, hic Ἀμαθείας κέρας, alius κηρία, partim λειμῶνας, quidam LECTIONES SUAE, alius ANTIQUARUM LECTIONUM, atque alius ἀνθηρῶν et item alius ἐδρημάτων. Sunt etiam qui λόγους inscriperunt, sunt item qui στρωματεῖς, sunt adeo qui πανδέκτας et Ἐλιζῶνα et προβλήματα et ἐγχειρίδια et παραξιφίδας. Est qui MEMORIALES titulum fecerit, est qui πραγματικά et πάρεργα et διδασκαλικά, est item qui HISTORIAE NATURALIS, est παντοδαπῆς ἱστορίας, est praeterea qui PRATUM, est itidem qui πάγκαρπον, est qui τόπων scripsit. Sunt item multi qui CONIECTANEA, neque item non sunt qui indices libris suis fecerint aut EPISTULARUM MORALIUM aut EPISTULARUM QUAESTIONUM aut CONFUSARUM, et quaedam alia inscripta nimis lepida multasque prorsum concinnitates redolentia. And the aim which Nonius had in view may be well described in the words of Gellius l. c. § 13, *primitias quasdam et quasi libamenta ingenuarum artium dedimus, quae virum civiliter eruditum neque audisse umquam neque attigisse, si non inutile, haud quidem certe decorum est.**

It is due to the scholars whose opinions I endeavored to controvert in my two essays on Verrius Flaccus that I should exhibit in all possible detail the evidence on which I have based my own conclusions. I have therefore written out all the passages in the first book of Nonius to which parallels can be adduced either from Verrius Flaccus or from later commentators and grammarians, hoping to deal on a future occasion with the other lexicographical and antiquarian books in a similar manner. The facts, so far as I have been able to collect them, will thus be in possession of the reader, who will draw his own inferences from them.

HENRY NETTLESHIP.

(To be continued.)

II.—ON THE SEPARATION, BY A WORD OR WORDS, OF *TO* AND THE INFINITIVE MOOD.

Our infinitive, where *to* precedes it, having been generally, of old, dativo-gerundial, it is pertinent, at the outset, to note, in connexion with phrases on the model of "able *to thoroughly bake* bread," such a phrase as "conducive *to thoroughly baking* bread." *Bake*, as here used actively, originated, by ~~detrition~~, from the gerund *bacanne*, which further contributed, along with a verbal substantive, towards the development, what between corruption and confusion, of the present participle *baking*.

With reference to expressions typified by *to thoroughly bake*,¹ three points, constituted by their age, the extent to which they have found favour, and the motives which have led writers to employ them, are successively to be examined.

First, however, it is in place to exhibit a specimen or two of the remarks which they have called forth from those whose attention they have attracted.

Mr. Richard Taylor wrote, in 1840:² "Some writers of the present day have a disagreeable affectation of putting an adverb between *to* and the infinitive." On this there is little to observe, except that Mr. Taylor, as he obviously supposed himself to be censuring a modernism, must have read the English literature of past times either sparingly or carelessly; and that, if he had reflected awhile, perhaps he would have discovered, at least on the part of adepts in composition, some more respectable reason than "affectation" for their sanction of the verbal arrangement which he disrelished.

From the late Dean Alford I next quote a paragraph, in which, as to circumspectness, information, and logic, his philological characteristics are displayed much at their average. It is as follows: "A correspondent states [*sic*] as his own usage, and defends, the

¹ "To adopt and scrupulously observe rules." "Nor to utter or even harbour resentment." It is not to be said that, in these clauses, "*to*" does double duty, and belongs to "scrupulously observe" and "even harbour." Rather, there is an ellipsis of *to* between the adverb and the verb.

² At p. xxx of his edition of Tooke's *Diversions of Purley* published that year.

insertion of an adverb between the sign of the infinitive mood and the verb. He gives, as an instance, '*to scientifically illustrate.*' But, surely, this is a practice entirely unknown to English speakers and writers. It seems to me that we ever regard the *to* of the infinitive as inseparable from its verb. And, when we have already a choice between two forms of expression, '*scientifically to illustrate*' and '*to illustrate scientifically,*' there seems no good reason for flying in the face of common usage."¹

In this judgment, Dean Alford distinctly lays claim to complete acquaintance with the scope and contents of a universal negative; and it rarely happens that a pretension of this kind can confront, with safety, any but vulgar and uncritical receptiveness. The certitude of ~~decanal~~ instinct, however confidently professed, is not, forsooth, to the eye of science, so conclusive as a demonstration of Euclid. With tiresome frequency, Dean Alford has betrayed how insufficiently he was qualified, as a student of English, to arbitrate positively on a matter of usage. Nor, in the comments before us, does he simply evince his unfamiliarity with the byways of our vernacular phraseology.² The "practice" which he disapproves is, he says, "entirely unknown to English speakers and writers"; and, accordingly, his correspondent, unless to be counted as nobody, wrote in a foreign tongue. Besides this, we are given to understand that it is with "common usage" alone that the "entirely unknown" expression is at variance. Simultaneously, then, one and the same turn of speech is quite unprecedented and is merely of rare occurrence. Furthermore, that which approved itself to the Dean as an inflexible maxim, namely, that the infinitival *to* is always to be succeeded immediately by its verb, must, in order to its validity, be warranted by an appeal to the absolute consensus of good usage; but, since this consensus cannot be challenged on his behalf, the maxim falls to the ground.

Probatory passages akin to those subjoined, but many generations earlier than the earliest of them, are, very likely, producible.

¹ *A Plea for the Queen's English* (2d ed. 1864), p. 188.

² If Dean Alford had so much as been minutely conversant with a writer whose "Works," so-called, he edited in 1839, he would have been aware that "*to scientifically illustrate*" is matched, in a single small volume by Dr. Donne, five times, at least, as I shall presently point out.

The verb *experience*, of which, according to Dean Alford, "no instance . . . occurs till quite recently," is also seen at p. 165 of the same volume; and, as it was there in print in 1633, so it had then been in print for upwards of a century.

Yet it is something to be able to show that the speciality of construction here investigated can be traced back as far as to Wyclif's coadjutors and first disciples, if not to Wyclif himself.¹

"For this was gret unkyndnesse, to this manere trete there brother, that algatis mekeli dide so grete kyndness agen; and it was an opyn untreuthe, to this manere hate her God." *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, edited by Mr. Thomas Arnold, M. A. (1869-1871), Vol. I, p. 175.

"And it hadde betre be to hem to nevere have resceyved Cristendom, but gif thei enden trewely in Goddis comaundementis." *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 196.²

"So oure good God byndith us not to evermore trowen," etc. *English Works of Wyclif hitherto Unprinted*, edited by Mr. F. D. Matthew (1880), p. 349.

"Also the popis lawe biddith men to not here the massis of prestis that ben comyn lechours." *Ibid.*, p. 418.

"To not do veniaunce," "to not obey," "to not wel assent," "to not mishe-wis," "to not assent." *An Apology for Lollard Doctrines*³ (Camden Society, 1842), pp. 33, 38 (two extracts), 43, 84.

"Forsothe Y say to you to nat swere on al manere." "But Y say to you to nat agein stonde yvel." *St. Matthew*, v, 34, 39, in the earlier Wyclifite translation of the Bible, dating about 1389.

In an anonymous romance,⁴ apparently of the same age as some of the works just quoted, occurs "forto not falle."

Although, for perhaps the first half of the fifteenth century, I can bring forward nothing to my present purpose, others will, without question, intersperse the gap with numerous relevant citations.

Bishop Pecock's *Repressor*, the probable date of which is about 1456, is thickly strewn with expressions like forto first geve, forto

¹ Though not a single sentence of all that has been handed down as from the pen of Wyclif can unhesitatingly be averred to have reached us in his very words, yet many of the writings attributed to him and to his followers, and even the extant manuscripts of some of those writings, certainly belong to the fourteenth century.

² See also *ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 63, 76, 171, 202, 204; Vol. II, pp. 256, 303, 304, 361; Vol. III, pp. 225, 264, 369, 409. In these places, *freely, meekly, not, quemeely* (becomingly), *thus*, and *truly* are disjunctive. *dojane*

Here, and elsewhere in these notes, and also where only two or three words are quoted connectedly in them, the spelling is modernized.

³ It is singular that neither of the two greatest authorities on Wyclifite literature, the Rev. Dr. Walter W. Shirley and Mr. Thomas Arnold, takes the least notice of this work. The opinion of the Rev. Dr. J. H. Todd, its editor, touching its authorship, deserved, at least, passing mention. For reasons why I am disposed to think that it is not to be assigned to Wyclif, see *Modern English*, p. 49, foot-note 3.

⁴ *Knight of La Tour-Landry*, p. 50. This work is referred, by its editor, Mr. Thomas Wright, to about A. D. 1372.

so seie,' etc., etc. Three parts in four of the *Repressor* yield upwards of thirty such instances. Epecially noteworthy, among them, are the following:

"Whanne ever he takith upon him for-to in neighbourli or brotherli maner correpte his Cristen neighbour or brother," etc. P. 2.

"The more able, as bi that, he schal be forto perfittli, sureli, and sufficientli undirstonde Holi Scripture," etc. P. 43.

"Therefore it is no nede me forto, as here in this booke, encerche the writingis of Doctouris," etc. P. 71.

"Oon maner is bi tirannie, which is forto, in alle decdis of overte, awaite and performe her owne profit oonli," etc. P. 299.

In another treatise by Bishop Pecock, which may have preceded the *Repressor* by a few years, we find "forto so more witnesse," "forto it bitleve," "forto in it bitake," etc., etc.

Not long before or after 1471, Sir John Fortescue³ wrote:

"It is not good for a kyng to oversore charge his people."

For upwards of fifty years subsequently, I have, again, nothing in point to produce; though it cannot be doubted that the authors belonging to that interval would, if examined closely, be found to afford many samples of the stamp of expression here considered.

In the extracts which follow, the context of the phrases quoted will, for the most part, be copied but very briefly, where not omitted altogether.

"To newe reedefy the castell." Lord Berners, *Froissart* (1523-1525), Vol. I, p. 120.

"To not believe it." Tyndale (1533), in *Works*, etc. (Parker Society), Vol. III, p. 234.

"To flatly gainsaye." Rev. Dr. Thomas Stapleton, *A Fortresse of the Faith*, etc. (1565), fol. 23.

"To truly performe this my will." Marie, Countess Dowager of Northumberland (1572), in *Wills and Inventories* (Surtees Society), Vol. II, p. 7.

"To covertly hide one flasket in the rushes." Sir John Harington (1608), in *Nugae Antiquae* (ed. 1804), Vol. I, p. 381.

¹ Pp. 5, 25. Single words elsewhere interposed are aright, it, meekly, not, them, thereby, therein, therewith, well. Add by their power, in them, on him, so richly, the more likingly, the rather, thereby thus, wisely and duly.

² A *Treatise proving Scripture to be the Rule of Faith* (1688), pp. 26, 34, 36. In other places, as at pp. 18, 27, etc., the single words *not* and *so* are separative.

The work here named comprehends, as printed, only about a third of the whole; and its genuine title is *The Book of Faith*. See the *Repressor* (1860), Introduction, p. xxxii, note 2, and p. lxvii.

³ *Works* (1869), p. 462.

1583-1680

"To judiciously weigh," "to strongly sustaine," "~~to always have~~," "to well rule or governe," "to well rule one's selfe." Rev. Dr. John Donne (died 1631), *The Auncient History of the Septuagint* (ed. 1633), pp. 47, 51, 107, 127.

"~~To but onely retorne home~~," "~~to both strike and thrust~~." James Hayward, *The Banish'd Virgin* (1635), pp. 20, 101.

"To injuriously oppresse." Henry, Earl of Monmouth, Translation of Biondi (1641, etc.), Books I-III, p. 112.

"To grosly make the Scripture like a nose of wax." Rev. John Eaton, *The Honey-combe of Free Justification*, etc. (1642), p. 282.

"To either place himself." Rev. Dr. Henry More, *Conjectura Cabbalistica* (1653), p. 246.

"To either believe or misbelieve a thing." *Id.*, *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus* (1656), p. 10 (ed. 1662).

"To either excuse, complete, or," etc. *Id.*, *A Collection of Several Philosophical Writings* (1662), The Preface General, p. ix.

"~~To better regulate~~." Anon., *The History . . . of China* (1655), p. 149.

"To well manage our affections." Sir Thomas Browne (died 1682), *True Christian Morals*, I, 24.

"To fully convince myself." Samuel Pepys (1699), *Diary*, etc. (ed. 1875, etc.). Vol. VI, p. 197.

"To first acquaint your Grace with it." Rev. Dr. Richard Bentley (1716), *Works* (1836, etc.), Vol. III, p. 479.

"To utterly abandon." Rev. Myles Davies, *Athenae Britannicae* (1716), Vol. II, p. 345.

"~~To just waft them over~~." Defoe, *A New Voyage*, etc. (1725), p. 152 (ed. 1840).

"To occasionally throw." Miss Catherine Talbot (1752), in *Miss Carter's Letters to Miss Talbot*, etc., Vol. II, p. 74.

"~~To far exceed~~." Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry*, etc. (1756), Part III, Section VI.

"To effectually stifle." *Id.*, *Works* (ed. 1826), Vol. XII, p. 69.

"To boldly assert." John Wilkes, *The North Briton*, No. XIX (1762).

"To exactly resemble." Samuel Foote, *The Patron* (1764), Act I, Scene I.

"To quite bereave one of one's wits." Charles Dibdin, *The Quaker* (1777), Act I, Scene I.

"To even bear with." Madame D'Arblay (1778), *Diary and Letters* (ed. 1842, etc.), Vol. I, p. 55.¹

"Milton was too busy to much miss his wife." Dr. Johnson, *Life of Milton* (1779).

"To completely remove your fears." Frederic Pilon, *He Would be a Soldier* (1786), Act V, Scene I.

¹ No writer that I know of is so fond as Madame D'Arblay of the sort of disjunction for which she is here adduced. But a single quotation must answer as a specimen of the scores furnished by her *Diary and Letters*, novels, and Life of her father. Among her *intercalations*, as in "to even bear with," are *absolutely*, *again*, *as little*, *both*, *constantly*, *coolly*, *entirely*, *frequently*, *instantly*, *quietly*, *quite*, *really*, *sometimes*, *thus*, *wholly*.

"To directly advance." Mr. Hammond (1787), in *Olla Podrida*, No. 34.

"To fully believe." Robert Southey (1801), in *Life and Correspondence*, Vol. II, p. 156.

"To entirely subside." S. T. Coleridge (1802), in *Essays on His Own Times* (1850), p. 587.

"To clean wipe me out." Charles Lamb (1827?), in *Letters* (1837), Vol. II, p. 211.

"To sharply characterize." William Taylor, *Historic Survey of German Poetry* (1830), Vol. III, p. 378.

"To not unfrequently make excursions," "to still further limit the hours." William Wordsworth (1843), *Prose Works*, etc. (1876), Vol. III, pp. 205, 209.

"In order to fully appreciate¹ the character of Lord Holland," etc. Lord Macaulay, *Critical and Historical Essays* (1843), Vol. III, p. 315.

"To often furnish." Mr. Thomas De Quincey (1850), *Works* (ed. 1862, etc.), Vol. XVI, p. 120.

"To justly estimate." Mr. Herbert Spencer, *Social Statics* (1851), p. 124.

"To first imperfectly conceive," "to perpetually repeat," "to positively assert." *Id.*, *Essays*, etc., Vol. I (1858), p. 242; Vol. II (1863), p. 203; Vol. III (1874), p. 257.

"To rigorously criticize," "to openly reassert." Bp. C. J. Ellicott, in *Cambridge Essays* (1856), pp. 158, 178.

"To actually mention." Mr. Matthew Arnold, *On Translating Homer* (1861), p. 72.

"To somewhat abate," "to actually group." *Id.*, *Schools and Universities on the Continent* (1868), Preface, p. viii, and p. 207.

"To humbly offer." *Id.*, *Culture and Anarchy* (1869), p. 95.

"To clearly understand." Mr. John Ruskin, *Unto this Last* (1862), p. 82.

"To gradually awaken." Mr. John W. Hales, in *Essays on a Liberal Education* (1867), p. 306.

"To notably increase," "to rudely enforce." Dr. Henry Maudsley, *The Physiology and Pathology of the Mind* (1867), pp. 207, 208.

"To straightway deny," "to clearly realize." *Id.*, *Body and Mind* (1870), pp. 57, 102.

"To nearly ruin." Mr. W. R. Greg, *Literary and Social Judgments* (1868), p. 445, foot-note.

"To just hand him the letter." Mr. Charles Reade, *Put Yourself in his Place* (1870), Vol. III, p. 32.

"To perfectly realize." Mr. Winwood Reade, *The Martyrdom of Man* (1872), p. 171.

"To continually spread." Bp. Samuel Wilberforce, *Speeches on Missions* (1874), p. 116.

"To rationally demand." Mr. St. George Mivart, in *Essays on Religion and Literature*, Third Series (1874), p. 220.

"To really express." Mr. Richard Congreve, *Essays*, etc. (1874), p. 479.

"To thoroughly understand." Bp. Ullathorne, *Mr. Gladstone's Expostulation Unravell'd* (1875), p. 22.

¹ Substituted for "fully to appreciate," for which see the *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. LXXIII (1841), p. 561.

"*To innocently rot.*" Mr. Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought*, etc. (1876), Vol. I, p. 440.

"*To utterly destroy.*" Major R. D. Osborn, *Islam under the Arabs* (1876), p. 166.

"*To still keep,*" "*to so much as look,*" "*to again approach.*" Mr. W. H. Mallock, *The New Paul and Virginia* (1878), pp. 7, 73, 82.

"*To punningly translate.*" Mr. T. L. Kington Oliphant, *The Old and Middle English* (1878), p. 73.

"*To hastily borrow.*" Rev. Dr. F. G. Lee, *The Church under Queen Elizabeth* (1880), Vol. I, p. 22.

Other sources than those which have here been laid under contribution, even if they were restricted to creditable living authors, would increase, to an indefinite extent, the preceding array of citations and references, which, moreover, might be augmented by recourse to almost any chance number of almost any first-class English journal of the last fifteen or twenty years. The question of usage, as concerns the matter in hand, consequently calls for no further particulars of proof.

The expressions observed on simply exemplify an extended application of the principle which has given us the verbs *anneal*, *backslide*, *foretell*, *gainsay*, *half-bind*, *misbelieve*, *outlive*, *overthrow*, *partake*, *undersell*, *uproot*, *withdraw*, and so on, with the obsolete *tobreak*, *torend*, etc., etc. The original of *to fulfil*—*fulfyllan*, in Anglo-Saxon,—was *to full fill*, that is to say, *to fully fill*; and time might give us *to full appreciate*, if we had as frequent occasion to speak of "appreciating fully" as our forefathers had to speak of "filling full," or "accomplishing."

Though words and phrases are employed by very few persons save in passive sequacity of others, yet those who introduce them, and equally those who accept them deliberately, are generally influenced by something better than, for instance, a love of singularity or of innovation. And especially is this true of words and phrases which succeed in winning the practical suffrages of good speakers and writers. We are under no necessity, therefore, of setting to the account of "affectation," as a learned editor, already mentioned, has done, their choice of locutions like *to fully appreciate*. By this verbal collocation some of them, at least, it may be, conceive that they express notional ~~incomplexity~~ more directly than it is expressed by *fully to appreciate*, or by *to appreciate fully*; just as is the case with *to uphold*, in comparison with *to hold up*, "defend," or with *to revisit*, in comparison with *to visit again*.

relevant situation

Principle

notional incomplexity

How it has come to pass that professional authors so voluminous as Dr. Johnson, Lord Macaulay, and Mr. De Quincey are seen to furnish, so far as appears, only one example, each, of the phraseology under discussion, it would be fruitless to inquire. It is, however, somewhat remarkable, that the consideration which prompted those scanty examples, whether it was that which has been suggested above, or whether it was a desire of terseness, or of euphony,¹ did not operate to multiply them in the pages of the vigilant stylists who have thus just countenanced their type.

FITZEDWARD HALL. (1)

¹Now and then we come upon a sentence of which, if we stop short of altering its infinitive, the apparent nonsense can be removed only by resorting to such a construction as that here treated of. "I hope not much to tire those whom I shall not happen to please." Dr. Johnson, *Rambler*, No. I. Many would now write: "I hope to not much tire," etc. And Dr. Johnson, in his letters to Mrs. Thrale, has, most unclearly, "I think not to stay here long," and "the black dog I hope always to resist." Take, again, the sentence, quoted and commented on by Mr. Gould Brown: "Honour teaches us properly to respect ourselves." The ambiguity of this may be obviated by putting "to properly respect," or, still better, by ending the sentence with the adverb.

Mr. Brown, referring to Burns's "to nobly stem," observes: "The right to place an adverb sometimes between to and its verb should, I think, be conceded to the poets." *Grammar of English Grammars* (ed. 1873), p. 661.

terse
euphony

ambiguity

poet

III.—FINAL *AS* BEFORE SONANTS IN SANSKRIT.

Prefatory Note.—The substance of this article was presented in a paper read before the American Oriental Society at its meeting in New Haven, October 26, 1881; and a concise report was published in the "Proceedings" of that meeting (pp. iv-vii), under the title: "On non-diphthongal *e* and *o* in Sanskrit." A renewed investigation of the subject has served not only to support and clarify the views which were then expressed upon much less extensive data, but has also, it is believed, brought out some new facts which deserve notice; and I am thus led to present the subject anew, and in a fuller form than a report in the "Proceedings" will permit of.

That the value of Sanskrit *e* and *o* is usually correctly defined by the statement that they represent original diphthongs, is clear and universally accepted. These diphthongs reach back either to the period of the common life of the family, in cases like *é-mi* = *εἶμι*; *ri-réc-a* = *ῥέ-λοιπ-α*; optative *bhdre-ta* = *φέρου-τε*; genitive *sūnos* = Gothic *sunaus*; or they are still more evidently diphthongs when they are direct results within Sanskrit itself of the meeting of an *ā* with *i* or *ū*.

To the Hindu grammarian *e* and *o* are always diphthongs; he knows no exception. When final *as* changes to *o* before a sonant consonant he either assumes with unrelaxing consistency that the *s* has in some way or other been supplanted by *u* and that this *u* has then united with the preceding *a* to the diphthong *o* (Atharva-Prātiçākhyā I 53-4; Pāṇini VI, 1, 113-4), or, what amounts to the same thing, final *as* as a whole has changed to *o* the diphthong (R̥k-Prāt. IV 8; VS-Prāt. IV 41, 42; Tāittiriya-Prāt. I 9); cf. Weber, Kuhn und Schleicher's Beiträge III 391 fg. This is the extremest case; still less do they think of regarding an *e* or *o* in other surroundings as anything else than a diphthong.

The older European grammarians (Bopp, Lassen, etc.) accepted the Indian view with regard to *e* and *o* with little or no modification; and whatever scepticism has cropped out here and there since Bopp has not been strong enough to procure distinct recognition,

in any connected grammatical treatise, for a value other than diphthongal. If it is remembered how the opinion that Sanskrit *a* is everywhere an original *a*-sound, and everywhere the same sound, has gradually been undermined within the last few years, *a priori* scruples against an attack upon the singleness of the character of *e* and *o* will be easily laid aside, even if it be possible to establish a non-diphthongal value only in isolated cases.

In the first place it is impossible to extend the diphthongal explanation to the *e* of the so-called contracted weak perfect stems, stems like *sed-* in *sed-imā*; *men* in *men-ē*, etc. For the following reason: The type of these weak perfects is older than the beginning of the separate life of the Indian languages, it goes back to the common Indo-European period, and any explanation of it made for Sanskrit alone is insufficient; therefore, if the *e* in forms like these is explained as a diphthong, this same explanation must hold good for all other languages which exhibit this kind of weak perfect stems. This is not the case. The history of this type may perhaps be most justly presented by the following short sketch: The Indo-European perfect was non-thematic, and possessed that distinction between strong and weak stems which is so admirably preserved in Sanskrit and German. The singular active of the perfect was made with strong root-forms, accompanied by the tone on the root-syllable (*ri-réc-a*); the other numbers of the active, the entire middle and the participle were formed with weak root-forms accompanied by the tone on the suffix (*ri-ric-mds*, *ri-ric-vāṁsam*, etc). In the case of the root *sad*, and possibly one or two others, the weak stem became subject to euphonic changes which resulted in the form *sēd-*. The strong form was **sē-sód-*; the weak **sē-sd-* α ; here the inner *s* became sonant before the sonant *d*: **sē-zd*; sonant *z* fell out, leaving behind it only its 'voice' (stimmton) which *lengthened* the preceding *ē*, leaving *sēd-* as the result. This *sēd* has survived in Sk. *sēd-imā* (: *sa-sād-a*); Gothic *sēt-um* (: *sat*), and Lat. *sēd-imus*; in Latin the weak stem supplanted the strong, and we have *sēd-i* for **sē-sod-i* in the singular also. This explanation of *sēd-* finds support in the perfectly parallel history of the present stem belonging to the same root: Sk. *sīd-ati*, Zend *hīd-aiti*, Lat. *sid-it*; these words represent a reduplicated thematic present-formation **sī-sd-a-ti* (like Vedic *pī-bd-a-*, *jī-ghn-a-*; Greek *μῑ-μν-ω*, etc.), where the *s* of the root coming before the sonant *d* was changed into *z* (**sī-zd-*); this *z* fell out and its voice again lengthened the preceding *i* to *ī*.

This explanation of the type *sēd-* emanates from Delbrück, *Altindisches Verbum*, p. 118, and it has been presented with minor variations by Scherer, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*,² 232 fg.; Joh. Schmidt, *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* XXV 60 fg.; Kluge, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der germanischen Conjugation*, 59 fg.; De Saussure, *Mémoire*, p. 12, note, and others¹; this *ē* definitely breaks the singleness of value of Sk. *e*, and forms a safe basis for a renewed investigation of Sk. *e* and *o* in general.

In the type *sēd* there presents itself an Indo-European long *ē*, originated before the separation of the languages; there are a number of cases in which the same explanation of *e* as long non-diphthongal *ē* must be urged for the period of the separate life of Sanskrit. Such forms are the imperatives *ē-dhī* for **ēz-dhī* (**ēs-dhī*); *dē-hī* and *dhē-hī* for **dēz-dhī* and **dhēz-dhī* = Zend *dazdī* (for both); here again the *ē* is simple long *ē* the result of short *ē* plus the tone of a sonant sibilant which has itself fallen out; probably the same explanation holds good for the forms *nēdīyāms* and *nēd-iṣṭha* = Zend *nazdyō* and *nazdista*; *mēdha*; Zd. *mazda*; *miyēdha*; Zd. *myazda*; *trṇēdhi* for **trṇē(z)h-ti* and a few others of a less transparent character which are mentioned by Joh. Schmidt, KZ. XXV 61-62.

The assumption of long *ē* is supported by the numerous cases in which long *ī* and *ū* are the results of short *i* and *u* and the same voice; which a sonant has left as compensation on falling out. The case of *sīdati*, Zd. *hidaiti*, Lat. *sīdit*, has been mentioned above; it is the only case which dates back to Indo-European times; within Sk. itself *mīḍhā* = *μισθός*; *nīḍā* for **nī-ḍā* for **nī-sdā* and *liḍhā*, perfect participle of *li(z)h* are examples; for *viḍu*, which Max Müller has connected with **λιον*, I suggest affinity with Lat. *vīridis* (for **vīs(i)duis*?), so that the *ī* in *viḍu* is again the result of short *i* lengthened by the voice of a sonant sibilant which has fallen out. It is hardly necessary to point out the familiar cases in which a *ū* has been lengthened in the same manner, e. g. in the participles *ūḍhā* for **uḍhā* from root *va(z)h*; *dūḍābha* for **dūḍābha*; *dūṇīṣa* for **dūḥṇīṣa*, etc.

The testimony which has been brought forward seems to point to the following thesis: Long vowels in Sk., when due to compensatory lengthening, are results of the corresponding short vowel

¹ The strongly deviating view of Fröhde in Bezzenberger's *Beiträge* VI 192, fg. is hardly calculated to overthrow this explanation.

plus the voice of the sonant, which has fallen out; in accordance with this thesis, long \bar{e} , \bar{i} and \bar{u} have been generated from their respective short vowels, as we have seen, and by the light thus gained we can now approach to better advantage the \bar{o} , resulting from compensatory lengthening.

The unique word for 'sixteen' ṣṣ-ḍaḍa (cf. ṣṣ-ḍhā 'sixfold') is especially interesting because it is so different in form from all the numerals with which it could be mentally associated, and numerals are notoriously subject to the workings of analogy; other forms containing the element for 'six,' or surrounding numerals for other numbers, cannot have developed the \bar{o} inorganically after their analogy; the change of ṣṣ into ṣḍ is a phonetic one. If we look at the usual forms in Europe (ḡḡ , *sex*) we should expect *ṣḡ-ḍaḍa for *ṣḡḡ-ḍaḍa (the cerebral ṣ at the end and its alterant effect upon the following ḍ being due to the $\text{kṣ} = \text{ḡ}$, which must have preceded the ṣ); there remains then the explanation of the \bar{o} instead of the \bar{e} . That this is due to the v of Zend *khshvas* and Armenian *vez*, the F of $F\epsilon\text{ḡ}$ of the Heraklean tablets and the w of Cymric *chwech*, which point to an original form *sveks , seems extremely probable. We must start in the explanation of the Sanskrit form from a pronunciation of the word, which may be rendered into writing well enough by *ṣḍṣ ; *ṣḍṣ-ḍaḍa had to become ṣḍ-ḍaḍa in perfect parallelism with dū-ḍabha , etc.; the \bar{o} of ṣḍ-ḍaḍa is simple long \bar{o} not a diphthong precisely as the \bar{e} of ēdhi , dēhi , etc.

The explanation of a few peculiar nominatives in the RV. leads to the same kind of formation as is exhibited in ṣḍ-ḍaḍa . They are *ava-yās* from stem *ava-yāj*; *puro-ḍās* from a stem *puro-ḍāḡ*, and the grammarians add a nominative *ṣveta-vās* and a corresponding vocative *ṣveta-vas* from stem *ṣveta-vāh*; in all three cases the stem ends in gutturals of the front (or palatal) series: ḡ, j, h . Joh. Schmidt, *Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen*, p. 11, 12, explains these forms as the result of phonetic union of the ending of the nominative s with the final of the stem. This explanation is untenable for two reasons: First, it operates with s of the nom. as though it were an element still alive within the special language; but the special language of the Indo-European family has no such element at its command; a form like *avayās* must be either a heritage from the common period, which no one will believe, or it is an analogical formation. Secondly, even if we were to admit the separate existence of the s of the nominative in the individual language, there is no reason why in these special few

instances there should be an exception to the Indian law for finals; according to this the *s* would fall off and leave *t'*: **avayāt*, etc. Indeed it will be found an impossible task to obtain phonetically nominatives like *avayās*, *puroḍās* and *ṣvetavās* from their respective palatal stems, and only the analogy of some form within the paradigms of these forms can have originated them. A full paradigm of *avayaj* would be: Singular, nom. *avayāt*; acc. *avayājam*; genit. and abl. *avayajās*, or possibly with *samprasāraṇa*: *avejās*; Loc. plur. *avayatsū* or *avayatsū*; from all these the nom. sg. *avayās* could not be the analogical offspring. Thus far the *bh*-cases have not been mentioned; they are indeed not quotable. That such forms must however have existed in the language is self-evident, and the grammarians are unanimous in reporting: *avayobhis*, *puroḍobhis*, and *ṣvetavobhis*; these forms can be organic in the following manner: We find that root-stems which have long *ā* in the strong cases often show *ā* in the weak ones; that this short *ā* is probably the representative of *ō*, or equal to *ō*, is shown by Greek declensions like *χθών*: *χθονός*: *χρώς*: *χρούς*; *σώ-φρων*: *σώ-φρονος*; *φλόξ*: *φλογός*; *ὕψ* to *ὀπός*²; assuming then for

¹ Or indeed possibly dental *t* with still further assimilation. Such cases are contained in the form *prayatsū*, locative plur. (TS. iv. 1. 8; VS. xxvii. 14); AV. has *prayaksu* which is evidently secondary. In the same direction points *anaḍtsu*, the locative pl. of *anaḍvāḥ* (RV.); this is the only phonetically correct form of the stem which shows a dental before a case-ending, and from this the *t* has spread over the other cases. According to the proportion *vidvādbhyas*: *vidvātsu*, the strange *anaḍvādbhyas* (AV.) was formed upon *anaḍtsu*. Possibly the curious form with dental *t* belonging to a palatal stem, nominative *paṣṭhavāt* from a stem *paṣṭha-vāḥ* (*paṣṭhavād vdyo* TS. 4. 3. 2 etc.), which is cited by Weber, Indische Studien XIII. 107, owes its existence to a locative form **paṣṭhavatsu*, which is to be sure not quotable; the archaic character of this *t* in the TS. is made probable by the fact that the same Sāṃhitā has preserved the form *dsṛt* (vii 4. 9) instead of the common but difficult *dsṛj*; *dsṛt* stands to *yakṛt* (or **yākṛt* in *yākare*: Old Zend-Pehlewi Glossary) precisely as Cypriot *ē(σ)αρ=εἶαρ* does to *ἡπαρ*; both have stems in *n* for the oblique cases: *yaknas* (whence perhaps the *ā* of *yakṛt*)=*ἡπατος* and *asnds*; cf. *śakṛt*: *śaknds*. The *t* is 'inorganic' as is shown by Iranian *yākare* and the derivative *asra*; it is the same *t* which appears at the end of root-nouns ending in short vowels: *vajra-bhṛt*, etc.; *j* in the same function is an anomaly. Is not a *dsṛj* a perversion by popular etymology (volksetymologie)? *√sṛj+ā* means 'to pour,' etc.

² In *φλόξ*: *φλογός*, and *ὕψ*: *ὀπός* the weak form has penetrated into the nominative; the old declension was **φλώξ*: *φλογός*, etc.; the long vowel has supplanted the short in *σκόψ*: *σكوπός*; *κλώψ*: *κλωπός*; *ὥψ*: *ὥπός* (cf. *οἶνοψ*); *πτώξ*: *πτωκός*; *φώρ*: *φωρός*; *φώς*: *φωτός*; *θώψ*: *θωπός*; in these the old accentual difference is still preserved; in *παρα-βλώψ*: *παρα-βλώπος*; *χειρο-βρώς*: *-βρώτος*; *δια-ῥώξ*: *δια-ῥώγος* both vowel and accent of the nominative have penetrated into the oblique cases; for the historical *ποιός* (Dor. *πῶς*): *ποδός* Joh. Schmidt KZ. xxv, 15 has rendered an older declension *πῶς* (**πῶς*): **πεδός* very probable.

the *bh*- cases: **ava-yōṣ-bhis*, *puro-ḍōṣ-bhis* and *ṣveta-vōṣh-bhis*, the sonant sibilant has, as in *ṣō-ḍaṣa* fallen out and compensated the short *ō* by lengthening it into *ō*. Forms like these, and as far as can be seen only forms like these, could give rise to nominatives like those of *as*- stems: *avayās*, etc., on the basis of a proportion like *āṅgīrobhis*: *āṅgīrās*=*avayobhis*: *avayās*; the grammarians offer also locative pl. *avayaḥsu*, etc., which is due no doubt to the same analogy. I am aware of course that under common circumstances it would be more natural to suppose that the *bh*- cases are due to the afterthought of the grammarians; but this would leave the nominatives a riddle. I add that the nom. sg. *sadha-mās* (RV. vii. 18. 7) by the side of *sadha-mād* (iv. 21. 1) cannot be explained with any kind of certainty even as an analogical formation, and only emphasize the fact that an organic explanation, such as would assume **sadha-mād-s* as an original form is not to be thought of.¹

Beset with difficulties are the formations with *ō* from the roots *vah* and *sah*; stems: *voḍhu-* and *voḍhar-* (RV.); *soḍhu-* *soḍhar-* and *soḍha-* in the classical language, where the Vedic presents only formations with *ā*: *sāḍhar-* *sāḍha-* *sāḍhvā* and infinitive *sāḍhyai* (Māitrayaṇī Samhitā I. 6. 3; Schröder, Einleitung p. xiv). If we consider the fact that the forms with *o* from the root *sah* are late, and that *sah* and *vah* are the only two roots in the language which show the final (*ṣ*)*h* preceded by short *a*, it will have to be admitted that the late *sāḍhar*, etc. are formed after the analogy of *voḍhar*, etc. This leaves us with the old forms *voḍhar* and *sāḍhar*. The first itself would offer no difficulty; the formations in which the palatal sibilant has dropped are all of them such as require *ē*: *voḍhar* is *vector*; *voḍhu-* is *vectu-*; it could then be readily assumed that Sk. **vōṣh-tar*, **vōṣh-tu* was changed to **vōṣh-tar* **vōṣh-tu* just as **sōṣ-daṣa* was referred to **ṣvōṣ-daṣa* above, i. e. the result of the labializing influence of *v* upon a following vowel; but an explanation that fits the root *vē(ṣ)h* must also fit the root *sē(ṣ)h*; it is therefore more probable that in both these cases the historical *ē* of the formation did not enter into the result; that *voḍhar* and *voḍhu-*

¹ It may be permissible to recall the fact that in the earliest language there are some points of contact between the declensions of *as*- stems and those of stems in final *t*; so when a vocative *haviṣmas* stands related to a dative *haviṣmata*; a vocative *vīdvas* to *vidvādbhis*, *vidvātsu*, etc. Compare also the remark of Brugman in KZ. xxiv, 21 fg. on *uṣād-bhis*: *uṣās-*, and *mād-bhis*: *mās-*, and Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar § 168.

are merely **vāḍhar* and **vāḍhu-* with their vowel labialized.¹ At any rate there is a gain in the recognition that the *ō* of *vāḍhar* and analogically that of *sāḍhar* etc. is long monophthongal *ō*; an explanation as **vauḍhar* is devoid of all foundation.

The main purpose of this paper is the explanation of the change of final *as* into *ō*. The *ō* before sonant consonants is not a diphthong; it is long *ō*, the result of short *ō* plus the voice of the sonant sibilant which has fallen out, but has left its traces in the lengthening of the preceding short vowel. *Short Indo-European ō is then not entirely dead upon Indian ground any more than short I. E. ě; both have escaped into certain long ē and ō; the euphonic change in a complex aṣvō dravati differs from that of a complex ē-dhi only in the quality of the short vowel which has preceded the change; *aṣvōz dravati is the immediate historic precursor of aṣvō dravati, precisely as *ēz-dhi is of ē-dhi.*² It needs scarcely

¹ With this *sāḍhar* for *sēḍhar* we may compare the cases in which Bollensen (Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morg. Gesellschaft XXII 574) assumes the change of final *as* before sonants into *ā*; especially *sahāvat* by the side of *sahovāt*; only that these are anything but archaic; they are made after all historical antecedents of *a* (*ē* and *ō*) had been totally forgotten; this it is hoped will be shown below sufficiently.

² Weber in Kuhn und Schleicher's Beitrage III 398, explains the change of final *as* to *ō* through the intermediate stage of a change into *ar*. He bases this view to a considerable extent upon a series of words in a single liturgical passage in the TS. and the Kāthaka-Samhitā, where a number of such cases actually do appear: *jinvdr, ugrdr, bhīndr, tveṣdr, grutdr, bhūtdr* and *pūtīr* (with a variant *pūrtīr*); the last only in the KS. In addition also a doubtful dative plural: *adbhyar* KS. XI 10; see Beitrage III 390-2. According to this all final *s*'s preceded by a vowel were once changed to *r*, and this *r* underwent still further changes in the case of *ās*. Not only are these few forms in *ar* rather to be explained as artificial imitations of stems ending in etymological *ar*: *ahar* (cf. *aharpati*), *ūdhar* *uṣar* etc. but there is room for the suspicion that on the contrary all final *s*'s preceded by vowels and followed by sonants may have originally changed to the sonant sibilant *z* which fell out, and, when followed by a consonant compensated the preceding vowel. As a remnant of this method we may perhaps regard the treatment of final *s* when followed by *r* in cases like *agnī rohati* etc. So also the Prakrit nominatives of *ī-* and *ū-* stems: *aggī, bandhū* etc., which were once used probably only before sonant consonants, but afterwards became general like *ō* for final *as* (*vaccho*=*vrkṣas*). The Pāli nominatives (*aggi, bhikkhu*) on the other hand are the forms before vowels extended in their use in the same way. In that case it becomes necessary to assume for Sanskrit, that the change of final etymological *r* before sonants to *s* before surds furnished the basis upon which all final *s* became *r* before sonants; i. e. as *pītur* appears in the form *pītus* before surds, so conversely *cakṣus* appears as *cakṣur* before sonants; while of the old forms before

to be pointed out that the same appearance of *ē* and *ō* is now almost universally regarded as the cause of the changing initials in form-couplets, whose initial belongs to the back-guttural series: *hānti* : *ghānds*; *hāras* to *gharmās*; *ca* : *katarās*, etc.

Of the difficulties with which this opinion is fraught no one is better aware than I am; I regard them however as by no means insurmountable. Above all, final *ās* is not everywhere equal to I. E. *ōs*; very often it is equal to I. E. *ēs*, and in such cases *ē* would be expected as the product of the short vowel and the voice of the sibilant; e. g. **agnayē dahanti* for **agnayēs dahanti*, instead of *agnayō dahanti*, etc. That this state of things did once actually exist in India appears to be rendered strongly probable by certain dialectic phenomena; instead of pointing out right here the cases in dialects in which final *as* turns into *ē*, I cite a passage out of Weber's article in Kuhn und Schleicher's *Beitraege* III 385 fg. entitled: 'Final *as* before Sonants in Sanskrit.' He is combating the native theory (accepted also by Lassen and Bopp) according to which the change of *as* into *ō* is explained as due to a change of the *s* into *r* and then of *r* into *u*, which combines with the preceding *ā* into the diphthong *ō*. He says: 'In various Prākṛit dialects, namely, partly in the inscriptions of Piadasi in the dialect of Dhauli and Babhra, and especially in the Māgadhi-dialect, there appears not *ō* but *ē* in the place of final *ās*, and in this *ē* an *u* can by no possibility be found inherent, nor can this be regarded as the result of weakening from *ō*; on the contrary its direct derivation from *ās* as a common basis (for both *ē* and *ō*) must be kept in view as the starting-point.' This passage written in 1863 sounds almost prophetic. In those days of the undisturbed rule of Indo-European *ā* in Sanskrit an explanation of this variation, which is based upon the fact that final *ās* corresponds partly to European *ōs* and partly to European *ēs*, could not suggest itself.

The reason why the historical difference between *açvō drdvati* and **agnayē dahanti*, which latter we are led to reconstruct, was

sonants: **cakṣu* (before vowels) and *cakṣū* (before consonants), only the latter has survived before *r* of the following word. Possibly the isolated nominative sg. *bhūmi* in RV. IX 61, 10: *uccā te jātām āndhaso divī śād bhūmy* (pada: *bhūmih*) ā dade: 'was oben deinem saft entsprang im himmel, hat die erd' erlangt' (Grassman); cf. Benfey, *Vollständige Grammatik* p. 294, note 8, may contain the more primitive sandhi in question; cf. however Pāraskara *Gṛhyasūtra* I 16, 17: *veda te bhūmi hrdayam* 'the earth knows thy heart.' The assumption of a neuter stem *bhūmi* offers a simpler explanation than that of the *padakāra*.

given up, is clear. As soon as the difference between **açvōs* and **agnayēs* before surds was wiped out, there was lost with it all *raison d'être* for a distinction between *açvō* and **agnayē* before sonants; as soon as short *ā* had absorbed within itself both short *ē* and short *ō* the distinction between *açvō* and **agnayē* must disappear and one or the other, probably the fittest of the two, will survive. The number of parallel processes which could be brought up from various quarters of I. E. grammar to show how again and again an original historical difference perished, as soon as the cause which had given it life had passed away, is well nigh infinite. One need but remember the almost complete wiping away of the distinction between weak and strong forms in the Greek perfect, which was lost no doubt in the main because the corresponding accentual difference had succumbed to the leveling recessive or enclitic accentuation. And in India, unless we are disposed to give up the attempt to account for the change between palatals and gutturals of the back-guttural series, the same absorption of *ē* and *ō* into *ā*, with which we are dealing here, has blurred the regular methods of interchange between *c* and *k*, *g* and *j*, *gh* and *h*, so that scanty remnants afford but the merest hint at the cause which once governed the interchange of these consonants.

I have said that of the two types *açvō* and **agnayē* the fittest would probably survive; for the language of the Veda and its lineal descendant the Sanskrit *açvō* may indeed be called so: for it is numerically far ahead of its rival. Without laying *too much* stress on numerical relations in such cases—for often a poorly represented formation gradually insinuates itself into the favor of a language at the expense of a prevailing one—it may be well to point out the fact that the cases in which final *as* represents *ōs* are much more numerous than those in which it represents *ēs*; for the nominal formations I employ the excellent table of Lanman in the appendix to his book on 'Noun-inflexion in the Veda.'

The nominatives sg. masc of *a*- stems alone occur 10,071 times, making about one-ninth of all nominal formations in the RV.; there are 1911 genitives and ablatives of consonantal stems masc. fem. and neuter; moreover 1421 nominatives and accusatives of neuter *as*- stems; these 13,500 cases are certain representatives of *ōs*; against this number the forms with *as* = *ēs* appear 3538 times in the nominatives and vocatives plural masc. of consonantal stems and of *i*-, *u*-, and *r*- stems; further the nominatives and vocatives plural fem. of the same stems amount to 1037; the vocatives singular of

as-stems according to the equation $\text{Satyá-çravas} = \text{'Ετερό-χλε(F)εζ}^1$ (Benfey, *Über die Entstehung des indogermanischen Vocativs*, p. 53) add 190 times, making in all 4765 forms, or a little over one-third the number of cases in which *as* = *ōs*. From the inflected forms of the verb only second persons singular with the secondary ending *s* bear on the question. In thematic forms like *ābharas* = ἄφηρες , *āruhas*, *āvarṭayas*, etc., and subjunctives of non-thematic stems like *āsas*, *tatānas*, *vādhiṣas*, *jalgulas*, etc. the final *as* is also = *ēs*; in all they are 478 forms (gained by count from Avery's lists in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* X. 232 fg.). By adding these to the nominal forms in *ēs* we obtain about 5250 *ēs*-forms against 13,500 *ōs*-forms; exactly 7 *ēs*-forms to 18 *ōs*-forms. This relation will not be affected materially one way or another by forms outside the inflections, or by some error which may have crept in. That this numerical superiority of the *ōs*-forms gives a fair picture of the corresponding superiority of the forms in *ō* before sonant consonants, and that this may have been the deciding factor in the question as to which should survive, is very evident. When this disappearance of *ē* for *as* began it is hard to say. On the one hand there are facts that would seem to prove that the process began in Aryan times, when the Iranian and Indian languages lived together; it is a *fait accompli* in the *Samhitās* of the Veda, and we find there traces of a substitution of *ō* for *as* even before surds, as in Pāli and Prākṛit (Weber in Kuhn und Schleicher's *Beitraege* III. p. 401, note); in most of the Prākṛit and Pāli dialects *ō* is simply substituted for *as* without reference to the character of the following sound; the Iranian has on the one hand carried the process of spreading the *ō*-forms farther than the Prākṛit and Pāli, namely into noun-composition; for in the Gāthic compounds, whose first part ends in *ō*, these first nouns are all *a*-stems, and there is no reason to doubt that the very frequent *ō* of their nominatives became so firmly associated with these stems, as to creep even into compounds (Bartholomae, *Die Gāthās*, p. 81); on the other hand the *as* has survived before enclitics: genitive *manahhō*, but *manahhaç-ca*, etc. But there are facts also which appear to prove that the *ō* accomplished the task of crowding out the *ē* separately in the various dialects of the Indo-Iranian languages; such are the victory of *ē* over *ō* in Magadha, and the distinct traces of *ē* by the side of *ō* in Iran, which will be pointed out below.

Final *ē* for *as* in India is well authenticated. If we had only the rule of the Prākṛit grammarians for the Māgadhi-dialect, that would

¹ The question whether *satya-* is or is not identical with *ēteo-* (cf. the Cypriot *'ΕτεFάνδρω*) does not concern us here.

suffice in spite of the evidently secondary and conventional form in which it appears there. Hemacandra (IV. 287) teaches that in the singular masculine *e* takes the place of *a*; *eṣa puruṣaḥ* becomes *eṣe puliṣe*, etc. Vararuci, *Prākṛta-prakāṣa* XI. 10 says that final *as* of nouns is changed to *e* or *i*; even *a* is permitted optionally. Practically the substitution of *e* for *o* in the Māgadhī-dialect goes farther than what is warranted even by the broader statement of Vararuci. Hemacandra seems to restrict himself in his sūtra to pointing out the most striking case of the change of *o* into *e*, namely the nominative; for under the examples illustrating his sūtra he gives strangely enough the sentence *karemi bhañte*, which is translated by *karomi bhavantaḥ*,¹ where both forms are not covered by his rule, and *karemi* for *karomi* not even by Vararuci's; practically, as far as I have been able to find out, probably all kinds of formative *o* can be replaced by *e*; at any rate an extension of *e* for *o* beyond the precincts of *o* = *as* may be observed. We shall scarcely be disposed to believe that this *e* is the result of a phonetic metamorphosis from *o*; still less that the grammarians have by an arbitrary dictate engrafted this rule upon the dialect. The case in which any broader phenomenon of Hindu language is a figment of their grammarians, not based upon some understructure of fact, even if a frail one, has still to be brought forward; on the other hand many phenomena of their languages bear witness to the fact, that data of limited extent, especially in the phonetic life of an Indian language, have often been arbitrarily enlarged, and have had a scope given them which originally did not belong to them. For this reason alone the *e* of the Māgadhī-dialect cannot be done away with, even if it does occur in all sorts of places; of course the inscriptional testimony is welcome. In the Aṣoka-inscriptions *e.g.* of Dhauli, which lies in the old district of Magadha (South Bihar) final *as* does really appear as *e* in genuine language. In the third edict of Piadasi he is styled 'devānām *pie* piadasi,' where the same edict in Girnar in Guzerat shows final *o*: 'devānām *pio*' (cf. Journal Asiatique, seventh series, Vol. XV. p. 492); or in the fourth edict we have in Dhauli the sentence: 'putā ca *piadasine*

¹ So at least according to Weber in Kuhn und Schleicher's Beitrage II 362. Pischel, Hemacandra, Vol. I, p. 144 (text) reads *karemi bhañte* = *karomi bhadante*; in the translation, Vol. II, p. 168, he reads *kalemi bhañte* = *karomi bhadanta*, and describes *bhadanta* as a vocative singular. In any case both *kalemi* (*karemi*) and *bhañte*, whether = *bhavantaḥ* or *bhadanta*, both exhibit a special fondness for *e*, which seems to be an extension from the regular *e* = *as*.

lajine pavaḍhayisaṃti' dhammacalanam'; in the same edict in Girnar: 'putrā ca potrā ca prapotrā ca devānām priyasa priadasino rāno vadhayisaṃti idaṃ dhammacalanam' (ibid. Vol. XVI. p. 219); final *e* for *as* is here a living fact,¹ and its explanation together with that of the usual *o* out of original *ēs* and *ōs* is certainly not made improbable by anything else that has been brought to bear on the question from another direction.

The form in which noun-stems in *as* in Sanskrit appear before the *bh*-case-endings has deviated from the original. For here as in the case of final *as* we must be guided by the vocalism of Europe; this is unequivocal; Greek *s*-stems exhibit the *os* only in the nom. acc. voc. neuter; everywhere else the stem ends in *es*: *μενες*- etc.; in this way also the archaic *bh*-cases are declined; we find in Homer: *ἐπέθεσ-φιν*, *στέθεσ-φιν*, *χρᾶτες-φι*, *ὄρεσ-φι(ν)*; *ὄχρεσ-φιν*; this latter still more archaically *ἔχρεσ-φιν* *ἄρμυσιν* in a gloss of Hesychius. According to this the *bh*-cases in Sanskrit ought to be preceded by long *ē*: **manē-bhis* for **manēz-bhis*, etc., instead of *manō-bhis*. Of such forms there is no trace even in the Veda; indeed the value of a few isolated forms of this kind would be small, as they would most naturally be explained as due to the corresponding cases of the *a*-declension (like *devebhis* RV.); so the Pāli *as*-stems do actually make *manebhi*, etc., but there is room here for the suspicion that this is an instrumental from an *a*-stem *mana-* (cf. acc. *manam*), although it may indeed be urged with equal plausibility that just such cases like *manebhi* = **manēz-bhis*, coinciding formally with the *bh*-cases of *a*-declensions gave rise to forms like *manam*, etc. But in the Veda the *as* of *s*-stems undergoes the same treatment as the final *as* before sonant consonants of a following word. Here however the Zend has preserved the historical form most strikingly: *raocē-bis*, *raocē-byō* from *raocāṇh*; *avēbis* from *avaṇh*; *açē-bis* from *açāṇh*; *maçē-bis* from *maçāṇh*, etc. with perfect regularity both in the Gāthā-dialect (whose testimony alone would be doubtful on account of its well-known partiality to this long *ē*)

¹ Possibly those vexing accusatives plural in Pāli: *yuvāne*: stem *yuvan* and in the *a*-declension: *dhamme*: stem *dhamma* may be the last traces of a change of *as* into *e*. It would, to be sure, be necessary to assume that the *e* strayed from the nominative and accusative plur. of consonantal stems into the *a*-stems; and that the *e* of the consonantal stems themselves afterwards succumbed almost entirely to the inroads of *o*. The *e* in a few other isolated cases like *sve*, *suvē* = *cvas*, *pure* = *purās*, etc. (E. Kuhn, Beiträge zur Pāli-Grammatik, p. 58) are also best accounted for in this manner, cf. also E. Kuhn in KZ. XXIV. 100, where the aorist-forms *apacise*, etc., are explained as equal to *apacisas*, etc.

and in the later Avestan. The position of this \bar{e} in the language points with perfect clearness to a genesis from a short vowel \acute{e} (Justi's and Hübschmann's e), and through this e to a connection with simple Sanskrit a . The nexus with the short e is clear from the frequent Gāthic lengthening of it to \bar{e} : *apēma* for *apema*; *spēnistā*, cf. *spenta*; *kehrpēm*: *kehrpem*, etc., further its alphabetic sign shows it to be nothing but a lengthening from e by the usual additional stroke; both e and \bar{e} stand therefore in the directest relation to Sk. \acute{a} ; long \bar{e} moreover is often directly the representative of Sk. \acute{a} as the result of secondary lengthening; here the intermediate stage with \acute{e} is perhaps lost: *spēnghaiti*=*śaṁsati*; Gāthic *emavañt*=later Avestan *amavañt*=Sk. *amavant*; cf. Hübschmann, KZ. XXIV. 328 and 333. On the other hand the long \bar{e} of these forms just as clearly shows affinity in character with that long \bar{o} , which stands for final *as*, and is actually seen to interchange with it in the Gāthās, and like it to vary with *as*; for when we have forms *manē* for *mānō*; *vacē* for *vacō*, *yē*, *kē*, (the latter *kas* when a particle *nā* follows) we are bound to recognize here that stage in which final \bar{o} s and \bar{e} s are still both in existence, although the law according to which these ought to supplement one another has been necessarily wiped out along with the difference between \acute{e} and \acute{o} ; the \bar{e} of *raocēbis* is the same as the final \bar{e} in the Gāthā-dialect, and has escaped that leveling process which has in the later Avestan substituted final \bar{o} for \bar{e} everywhere at the end of a word by virtue of its more protected position, unlike its Indian counterpart *rocobhis*. It is interesting and fortunate that there is no possibility of explaining *raocēbis*, etc., as analogical formations, because Zend has, unlike its sisters in India, separate forms for monophthongal \bar{e} and \bar{o} clearly differentiated from the *i*- and *u*- diphthongs. While an Indian **rocebhī* would be subject to the suspicion that it had in some way become contaminated by the *a*- declension, such an eventuality is here warded off by *daēvaēibīyō*, *arethaēibīyō*, etc. The Zend has therefore in some respects presented the most effective resistance to the process of decay which has set in upon final *as* in the entire Aryan family.

There remains an exception in Sanskrit, contained in the latter rule: final *as* before \bar{a} changes to *o* and the initial *a* following is dropped; the difficulty lies here in the fact that a syllable short by nature and position is lengthened for no apparent reason. It is believed that upon sifting this peculiar rule carefully, *the last but distinct trace of final ēs will be found on Vedic ground*. In the

later language not only final *o* from *as* produces the elision of initial *a*, but any other *o* also, and what is more, final *e* produces the same effect. To find that the euphonic rule for final *o* resulting from *as* has attracted to itself the rest of the *o* need not occasion surprise; for final *o* not the result of *as* are indeed rare throughout the language; there are scarcely any worth mentioning except those of the vocative of *u*-stems; cf. Whitney, § 134. In the RV. there occur a little over 500 such in all positions, and it is not worth while to count the cases in which they actually occur before *a*. Remembering that there are, according to the count above of inflectional forms alone, 18,750 forms in final *as*, not including common pronouns like *nas*, *vas*, adverbs in *as*, etc., it will be safe to say that the cases of direct diphthongal *o* are to those of *o=as* as 1:40; it is clear then that whatever law might gain ground for the majority would in all probability, either in the actual life of the language or in the grammatical handling of it, become rule for the small minority. Quite different is it with regard to final *e*. There is no final *e* alive in the later language which is other than a diphthong, or which is the result of a euphonic process, or which appears to stand in any nexus with final *as*. It is then a matter of just surprise to find it in the same category with *o*; yet as far as the later language goes it might be urged with a sufficient show of reason that the same conventionalism which has *e. g.* established the rule for the doubling of all final *n* under certain circumstances (Whitney, § 210) without reference to their antecedents, might also impose upon the diphthong *e* all the *sandhi*-qualities of what is to the Hindu grammarian always the *diphthong o*.

Turning to the Vedic language we find the complexion of the two rules we are dealing with changed materially. Final *as* is still written *o* before *a*, and we find this *o* again in juxtaposition with final *e*; for in the Veda also the initial *ā* of a following word is elided after *o* and *e*. Only with this difference, that here the elision is the exception instead of the rule. For the RV. Bollensen, *Zeitschr. d. deutschen morg. Gesellschaft* XXXV 467, offers as the result of an exact count the statement that of 480 cases in which the elision is written only 21 are warranted by the metre; on the other hand there occur also a few cases in which elision, though not written, actually does take place (*ibid.* 466); in the Sāma-Veda the 92 instances in which the elision is written are all to be restored; Whitney in a note to AV. *Prātīcākhyā* III, 54 states that the AV.

omits the *a* in writing in about one-third of the cases in which it is preceded by *e* or *o*; in actual pronunciation it is omitted only about one-fifth the number of its occurrences. Schroeder, *Mātrāyaṇi-Saṁhitā*, Introduction, p. xxix, finds that *a* after *e* and *o* is partly elided and partly left to remain. It will be seen that the Vedic phenomena present a very different situation; one which makes it impossible to explain the elision after *e* as a mere analogical process, an imitation for symmetry's sake of the properties of a parallel sound, the *o*; because we are dealing here with an ill-regulated tendency, itself too vague and undefined in order to furnish the firm foundation of facts likely to exercise the necessary attraction. It will be necessary then to recognize the fact that the elision after *e* just as that after *o* stands on its own basis, and to explain how two sounds of a character in general so widely different show the same tendency in the earlier language; the fact that this tendency has expanded itself into a law for the later language need concern us no longer. I remark here that there is nothing in the character of the sound following the *a* which either brings about or prevents the elision; Pāṇini indeed (VI 115-6) formulates the results of observation of the cases in which the elision actually occurs into rules; but these show that there is no organic nexus between the process of elision and the sound which follows the *a*; his rules, moreover, do not bring in all the kinds of sounds before which *a* is elided; cf. Benfey, Introduction to the *Sāma-Veda*, p. xxxi.

The organic parallelism between *e* and *o* in early times is proved by a still more striking fact. Adalbert Kuhn has shown in his acute investigations on Vedic language as reflected by metrical conditions, that in the RV. final *e* and *o* before vowels are themselves short vowels;¹ he draws this conclusion from those parts of the *pādas* of the most common metres whose laws of quantity are the most transparent and subject to almost no exception, namely the last four syllables of *jagati* and the last three of *triṣṭubh*; for these he rightly claims an almost perfect law of quantity, varied only by the varying quantity of the last syllable, the syllaba anceps; for *jagati*: dijambus or second paeon (◡—◡◡); for *triṣṭubh*: bacchius or amphibrach (◡—◡).

I have myself, in order to gain data for more precise statements, scanned all those hymns of Maṇḍala II, III, IV and V, which are composed in *triṣṭubh*, *jagati*, or both; omitting the hymns in which

¹ See especially Kuhn and Schleicher's *Beiträge* III, 118 fg.

these metres appear mixed or interchanging with 8-syllable metres. They are hymns II, 1-4, 9, 10, 12-19, 21, 23-31, 33-40, 42; III, 1-7, 14, 15, 17-20, 26, 30-36, 38, 39, 43, 46-50, 54-61; IV, 2-6, 11-14, 16-29, 33-36, 38, 39-45, 50, 51, 54, 58; V, 1, 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 15, 29-34, 36, 37, 42-49, 54, 55, 57-60, 62, 63, 69, 76, 77, 80, 81, 85; containing in all 5808 pādas; of which 154 refuse to obey the law for final cadence (◡—◡◡ for jagatī; ◡—◡ for triṣṭubh) as long as *e* and *o* are regarded as long before *a*; as soon however as it is admitted with Kuhn that the *e* and *o* are short before *a* there fall aside 131 of these 154 exceptions, 102 of *o*¹ and 29 of *e*², the *a* in all these cases remaining unelided. It is to be noted that none of these *e* and *o* are *pragṛhya*, and when in a single case an *e* which is *pragṛhya* occurs in the final cadence it is long.³ II, 2. 4d: pātho ná pāyūm jānasī ubhé ānu (jagatī); indeed there

¹ II: 1. 14a; 3. 3abc; 4. 9a; 9. 1d, 6b; 10. 5c; 14. 11d; 16. 5c; 18. 3d; 23. 4b, 14d, 15a, 18d; 27. 1d, 5a; 33. 5c; 34. 12d; 36. 3c; 38. 5b, 10b; 39. 5d, 8b; 42. 2b. III: 1. 12d; 4. 2b, 11a; 5. 9a; 7. 2a; 14. 1cd, 5d; 30. 19c, 20d; 31. 7d, 11b; 35. 1bc, 5b; 36. 6d; 46. 2b; 48. 3c; 56. 6b; 57. 1d; 58. 4d. IV: 2. 2a, 18a; 3. 6a; 4. 3c, 10a; 5. 2d, 12c, 15d; 6. 4b, 10c; 11. 6c; 13. 2a, 3b; 16. 3b, 19c; 20. 9c; 21. 4d; 23. 1c, 2b, 4a; 24. 3c; 26. 5d; 27. 5a; 33. 4c; 34. 1a; 39. 5d; 50. 1a; 58. 3b, 8b. V: 4. 2b; 8. 4c; 15. 1d; 29. 3d; 30. 11c, 13b; 31. 4c; 33. 2a, 8c; 34. 1b; 42. 5a, 15a; 43. 14b; 44. 5d; 45. 2c, 7a, 9c; 46. 4ac, 5d; 47. 4d; 49. 3c; 54. 8d; 55. 10d; 58. 3a; 76. 1b.

² II: 15. 4b; 27. 2a. III: 6. 8d; 17. 3b; 30. 2d; 32. 13a; 54. 7a. IV: 3. 4a, 11d, 15a; 4. 12a; 5. 8a; 6. 4a; 11. 1d, 4d, 6a; 33. 10b; 34. 5c, 9b, 11b; 35. 6a. V: 1. 4d, 5a; 4. 6d; 30. 12a; 31. 3c; 43. 5a; 59. 1d; 80. 2d.

³ Such cases are of rare occurrence in the RV. I find only six in triṣṭubh and jagatī hymns: I, 72. 6a: Triṣ saptā yād gūhiāni tuvē (tvē) it; I, 151. 4d. gaām na dhurī ūpa yuñjāthe apāḥ; VIII, 72. 3c: āvivāsan ródasī dhīṣṇie imé; IX, 70. 3b: ādabhiāso janūṣī ubhé ānu; X, 44. 4c: ójaḥ kṛṣva sám gr̥bhāya tuvē (tvē) āpi; X, 64. 14b: devī devāñ jānmanā yajñiye itāḥ. I find no cases of *o*; more numerous are cases of *pragṛhya ī* and *ū* in the tenth syllable of these metres: *e. g.* II, 1. 15d; 2. 5d; 27. 15d. III, 2. 2a; 34. 1d. V, 31. 6c; IX, 101. 7d, etc. It would appear then that the special quality of most of the *pragṛhya*-vowels consists in fuller or firmer length than that of the remaining long vowels, their quality of not combining with following vowels is accordingly merely an accessory of this special length; this appears also from their treatment in the Prātiçākhyas, all of which (except Tāittiriya-Prāt.) after enumerating the *pragṛhya*-vowels, add a special rule which declares the fact they are not combinable; cf. Whitney AV. Prāt. I, 73, note III, 33 note; the terms *pragṛhya*, *pragṛhita* and *pragraha* (TS.) seem also in no way to describe the real character of these vowels, but merely to indicate that the words containing them are especially emphasized or pointed out by the *iti* of the *pada-kāra*. Weber, Indische Studien XIII, p. 5, translates the term by the phrase: '(was man) hervorzuheben wünscht.'

occur in these final cadences only two other cases of *e* and *o* long before *a*; but in both of these the *a* is neither written nor read metrically: V. 29, 10^b; kútsāyānyād vāriṇo yātave 'kah (p. akar); and V. 31, 3^d: ví jyótiṣā samvavrtvát támo' vaḥ (p. avar) both in tristubh hymns;¹ so that there is left not one single exception to the law that final *e* and *o* are short before *a* when this *a* is not elided. If this result is accepted there remain but 23 exceptions in 5808 pādas to the law for final cadence,² and it may be worth while to observe that of these only 4 show long syllables for short in the 9th syllables of jagatī and tristubh,³ the 11th syllable of jagatī is inviolably short; the remaining exceptions consist in short vowels instead of long ones in the 10th syllable; there is then no reason whatever to doubt that *e* and *o* before *ā*, when they are not *pragṛhya* and when the *a* is not elided, are short.

The parallelism in the treatment of *e* and *o*, the result of final *as*, extends still further; not only are both—though written as diphthongs—short before *a*, but both *e* and *as* appear alike as *a* before all vowels other than *a*, with just as uniformly short metrical value in the case of *e* as in the case of *a(s)*. Of course the explanation of the change of *e* into *a* as given by the Hindu grammarians, excepting the RV-Prāt., means nothing; the assumption of a change of final *e* into **ay* and the subsequent dropping of the *y* is a purely theoretical artificiality; the manuscripts show nowhere any such intermediate stage as **ay*. No doubt the same cause which has substituted for final *a* a written *o*, pronounced short before *ā*, and a short *a* before all other vowels, has brought about the short value of written *e* before *ā*, and its appearance as short *ā* before

¹ Other cases of this kind in syllables not belonging to the final cadences are: VI, 9, 2^b; 22, 4^c; 36, 2^c; 50, 9^d, 10^c; the *e* and *o* before the elided syllable are always in the even (long) syllables of the verse.

² They are II: 1, 7^d, 9^c; 2, 9^d; 4, 1^b, 2^d, 3^d, 9^c; 19, 3^a; 28, 6^{ab}; 29, 1^a; 33, 14^d; 35, 11^b. III: 2, 5^d; 46, 2^d; 49, 1^a. IV: 4, 1^c; 16, 1^b; 21, 1^a. V: 33, 5^a, 7^a; 37, 2^b; 57, 6^a; most of these have been treated by Kuhn in his articles in Vois. III and IV of Kuhn und Schleicher's Beitrage.

³ II, 4, 9^c; suvīrāso abhimātiṣāhaḥ smāt (p. abhimāti-sāhaḥ!); II, 28, 6^b: énaḥ kṛvāntam asura bhrīṇānti (Kuhn und Schleicher's Beitr. III 122); III, 49, 1^a: cāmśā mahām ind(a)ram yasmin víḡvā (ibid. 124, end); IV, 4, 1^c: trṣvim ānu prāsitim drūṇāno (āp. λεγ. from √drū = √dru perhaps for *drūṇāno).

*all other vowels.*¹ The cases of *a* for *e* with undoubted short value, in those hymns of the IV. and V. maṇḍalas, which I have scanned, are IV: 17, 9^b; 20, 10^e; 34, 9^a; 40, 3^b; V: 1, 6^d; 11, 3^e; 12, 5^a; 43, 10^d, 14^a; 49, 3^b. Interesting is IV: 34, 9^{ab}, containing both treatments of final *e* before vowels in the 9th syllable of the two tristubh pādas; both are short, preceded and followed by long syllables: yé aṇvīna yé pitārā yā ūtī | dhenúm tatakshúr ṛbhávo yé áṇvā; cf. VI. 3, 4^{ab} and IV. 6, 4^{ab}.

Further, even in the evidently secondary treatment of final *as* and *e* in the Māitrāyaṇī the same persistent parallelism appears: Before all vowels other than *ā*, when these vowels are accented, final *as* and *e* when themselves unaccented change both to *ā*; otherwise this Saṁhitā follows the usual methods; see Schroeder, Zeitschr. d. deutschen morg. Gesellschaft xxxiii, 184, and Introduction to the Māitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā p. xxviii, fg.

It will not be amiss to emphasize again the fact that in treating final *o* and *e* we are handling two different sounds, which seem to share arbitrarily the same properties so long as *e* is nothing but a diphthong: for the proof that final *o* is read short before vowels in the RV., if we resolve it, means nothing more than that final *as* changes into a short vowel before *a*; for it must be remembered that with the exception of the few vocatives, etc., in diphthongal *o*, which do not enter as a perceptible factor, this *o* can only occur before *ā*, because *as* before other vowels changes to *a*. The proof so far is as nearly a linguistic necessity as possible. The lengthening or diphthongizing of the vowel of *as* before another vowel after *s* had fallen out would be a linguistic anomaly; all reason for compensation is here wanting, because *as* before a vowel is short by nature and position. We are in fact compelled to utilize this discovery of Kuhn in order to remove this thoroughly anomalous lengthening. But again what is to be done with the diphthong *e*, which is nothing but a diphthong in the historical period? The evidently organic parallelism of its treatment with that of final *as*

¹ The treatment of diphthongal *o* differs slightly from that of final *as* in the RV-Saṁhitā. Instead of appearing as *ā* before all vowels other than *ā*, it appears in this form only before labial vowels; elsewhere it becomes *av*; and the RV-Prātiçākhyā sees in this *v* an additional extraneous element, which it designates by the name *bhugna* (II, 11); the other texts do not know this additional *v* (see AV-Prāt. III, 40, note) and it is perhaps nothing but the particle *u*. Cf. also Osthoff, Morphologische Untersuchungen IV, p. 258, note.

precludes the possibility of resorting to the doubtful principles of 'metri gratia' or perhaps 'vocalis ante vocalem corripitur.'

I believe that I have prepared the way for the following solution ;

(1) Final *ōs* and *ēs* (written *ās*) simply dropped the *s* before vowels, whether *ā* or any other vowel followed, of course without lengthening the remaining short vowel. As the Indian alphabet possessed no signs for either *ē* or *ō*, they had to put signs actually existing in their places ; before all vowels except *ā* short *a* was chosen, the sign being indeed insufficient to render the color of the vowels, but doing perfect justice to the quantity ; before short *a* the disinclination for allowing two identical short vowels to follow upon one another was probably the motive which led to another possible expedient, namely that by which the vocalic color was preserved but the quantity sacrificed in writing by employing the signs *e* and *o*¹ ; this I regard as the starting-point from which the remarkable juxtaposition of *e* and *o* (*as*) in euphonic rules must be explained.

(2) These *ō* and *ē*, coinciding graphically with the long and diphthongal *o* and *e*, ended by attracting them to their own condition, so that all *o* and *e*, without reference to their origin, were pronounced short before *ā* ; but also the other vowels, which to be sure would occur almost only after *e*, were drawn into this rule, so that the shortening of *e* and *o* took place before all vowels, *i. e.*, all final *e* (except the *pragṛhya*) were subjected to a treatment precisely identical with that of final *ēs* ; and all final *o* to a treatment identical with that of final *ōs* ; this is the state which we found in the final cadences of the *pādas* investigated *without one single real exception*. It may be added as a valuable verification of what has been claimed here, namely, that an explanation on the principle 'vocalis ante vocalem corripitur' would be totally insufficient, that in a few instances the short values occur before consonants also ; Kuhn und Schleicher's *Beitraege* III, 119 and 454.

(3) Before the period from which our Vedic material dates the final *ō* (written *ō* /) for *ōs* had also absorbed the final *ē* (written *ē* /) for *ēs*, precisely as in the case of final long *ō* and *ē*, which were the result of compensatory lengthening before sonant consonants ; so that only those *e* were left which could preserve their independence from the fact that they occurred also in other connections

¹ Jacobi KZ. XXVI. 320 claims that final *e* and *o* in the oldest forms of Jaina-prākṛit are either long or short. Whether any historical meaning is to be attached to this fact it will be possible to see only after his promised edition of the *Ācārāṅga Sūtra* has appeared.

than merely before initial vowels, namely the diphthongal *e*, which had been drawn secondarily into the treatment as short vowels; so that we would have the last vestige of final *ēs* on Vedic and Sanskrit ground in the short value of *e* in the Veda, and also in the sporadic elision of the initial *a* following.

(4) I have thus far called the vanishing of initial *a* by the term which for the later language is well and expressive enough, namely elision. That it is however in reality not elision is clearly enough to be recognized from the fact that the accentuation which results after the *a* has disappeared is one which takes account of the *a*; the tone of the *e* and *o* that is left shows that the *a* has united with the *e* and *o*. Two peculiarities are then connected with this phenomenon, which seem a strong support to the solution as proposed thus far: (1) That *e* and *o*, when combining with following vowels do not resolve themselves into semiconsonantal groups (*ay*, *av*), as might be expected if they were diphthongs, and as actually is the case in internal combination (*nay-ati*, *bhav-ati*). (2) That the combination occurs so sparingly in the RV. The first difficulty falls aside because *e* and *o* are, as has been sufficiently shown, not diphthongal, but short *ē* and *ō*; *the law according to which these combine with following ā then lies before us; short ē and ō combine with following ā to long ē and ō, subject to the same accentual laws for the result as other combinations of two short vowels; cf. Whitney, Sk. Grammar, § 135 and 128. This appears with uncontrovertible certainty in the two cases RV. V. 29, 10^b and V. 31, 3^d, cited above (p. 17) where following ā is elided; these being in addition to the solitary *pragr̥hya*-case II. 2, 4^d, the only ones in the final cadences of 5808 pādas in which final *e* or *o* are long before vowels. Second, the sporadic occurrence of the union of these short *ē* and *ō* in the Vedas is simply due to the fact that in both cases a euphonic process has preceded, and the hiatus which is the result of sandhi is, as is well known, regularly allowed to remain, the second contraction being of rarer occurrence; cf. Whitney, Skr. Grammar, § 176, b; Weber, Kuhn und Schleicher's Beitrage III, 402; Kuhn, *ibid.* IV, 199 and 211; Roth KZ. XXVI, 50. To be sure with a vast difference in the chronology of the hiatus: hat between *ō* and *ā* is made before our very eyes; that between *ē* and *ā* appears as the last faint reflex of final *ēs*, kept alive only by the fortunate fact that this *ēs*, which became *ē* before vowels, but was written *ē* before *ā* attracted to itself by analogy the diphthongal *e*-sounds which were not liable to succumb to the inroads of the stronger sister-sound *ō*.*

A short review of the euphonic rules will not be amiss :

(1) Explanation of any kind becomes possible only if we operate with final *ēs* and *ōs*.

(2) These were once represented respectively as final long *ē* and *ō* only before sonant *consonants*; a lengthening for compensation before a *vowel* would be a linguistic anomaly.

(3) Long *ē* succumbed to its stronger sister-sound *ō* as soon as the cause of their original differentiation had been removed by the merging of both *ēs* and *ōs* into *ās*; the opposite process appears dialectically in India in the Magadhese district; *ē* is retained undisturbed in the *bh*-cases of *es*-stems in Zend; in the Gāthās final *ē* is also beheld still struggling for the supremacy with final *ō*; in the later Avestan it has also given way to *ō*.

(4) Before all vowels final *ēs* and *ōs* originally merely gave up the *s*, becoming *ē* and *ō*; on account of the insufficiency of the Indian alphabets *ē* and *ō* had to be rendered by other characters; in general they gave up their qualitative difference and became *ā*; before *ā* itself the signs for the long vowels and diphthongs were resorted to, making possible the retention of the *quality* or color of the vowels in writing; the short *quantity* moreover was retained perfectly by tradition in the metre.

(5) These *ē* and *ō* being written with the same characters as long and diphthongal *e* and *o* succeeded in attracting all of these excepting the *pragrhya* to their own treatment before *ā*; further, the treatment of *ēs* and *ōs* as *ā* before all other vowels was also extended to all other *e* and *o* again excepting the *pragrhya*.

(6) The so-called elision of *ā* after *ē* and *ō* in the RV., etc., is in reality a combination of each of these sounds with *ā*, the result being long *ē* and *ō* with regular accentuation for the combination of two short vowels; the sporadic character of the combination is due to the fact that their hiatus is not primary but secondary, in which cases it is usually left to remain.

(7) Finally it may be right to emphasize that the characters usually transcribed by *e* and *o* cover three couplets of sounds: (a) long monophthongal *ē* and *ō*; (b) respectively an *i* and *u*-diphthong; (c) short *ē* and *ō*.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

IV.—THE CHANGE OF *p* TO *t* IN THE ORRMULUM.

In the preface to his edition of the Ormmulum, Dr. R. M. White, under the head of peculiarities which "seem chiefly to relate to pronunciation and orthography," makes the following statement:

"We also find, with some exceptions, the change of the initial *p* into *t* after words ending in *d*, *dd*, *t*, and *tt*. Exceptions occur in compounded words, or when a word with the initial *p* is separated by the metrical point from that which precedes it, or lastly, in some instances, when it takes the vowel *u* after the *p*, as in *pu* and *purrh*."

A foot-note gives some illustrations of the change and the exceptions, and refers us to another note where we are told that the same change of *p* to *t* occurs also after *ss* in the phrases *pess te bett*, *pess te bettre*, *pess te mare*. This statement of the change, with the accompanying notes, contains all that White says on the subject, and as Mr. Holt, the editor of the last edition (Oxford, 1878) has added nothing to this statement of the author's usage, I infer that the change in question has not been investigated by any one else, although it forms a prominent peculiarity of Orrmin's language, and one that more than any other, except his systematic doubling of consonants, gives to the Ormmulum its specific character and appearance. It has seemed to me, therefore, worthy of a more careful study than the editors of the work appear to have given it.

Some years ago, when I first read the poem, I was led to doubt the exactness of White's statement of Orrmin's treatment of initial *p*, chiefly because I found that only a part of the words beginning with that letter appeared in the Glossary under *t* also; a circumstance from which I drew the inference that they either were not subject to change like the others, or, which seemed unlikely, did not occur after *t* or *d*. On a later reading I found my doubts confirmed, and began to take note of the exceptions and to try to formulate Orrmin's usage and discover the rule, if any, which he had followed. The result of my examination was the discovery of one or two peculiarities of usage, which, I have

reason to believe, have been overlooked hitherto, and which seem to me to be of enough interest and value to students of English to be worthy of publication.

On the basis of the change under consideration, the words of the Ormmulum that begin with *p* may be classified into three lists, viz:

(a) Words that do not occur after *t* or *d*.

(b) Words that occur after *t* or *d*, but do not change *p* to *t* when thus placed.¹

(c) Words that occur after *t* or *d*, and, in that position, change *p* to *t*.

The first list need not be given here. It comprises about a dozen words of rare occurrence, and it is, no doubt, a simple chance that no one of them happens to stand after *t* or *d*.

The second list comprises the following. I have added the number of times that I have found each after *t* or *d*.

1. <i>purrh</i>	369
2. <i>peowwtenn</i> ²	20
3. <i>pennkenn</i>	7
4. <i>preo</i>	5
5. <i>prifenn</i>	5
6. <i>pannkenn</i>	4
7. <i>pinnkenn</i>	3
8. <i>prisst</i>	3
9. <i>peod</i> (or <i>ped</i>)	2
10. <i>ping</i>	2
11. <i>putenn</i>	1
12. <i>peosternesse</i>	1
Total ³	424

¹In the first and second of these lists I have counted compounds with the simple words and derivatives with their primitives, not thinking it necessary to give a long list where no change is made in initial *p*. Thus under *purrh* are also included all cases of *pwerret*, and of verbs compounded with *purrh*, under *preo* is included one case of *pridde*, &c. In the third list I have given derivative words in full but only the first part in compounds, only that part being affected by the change. The figures given with the second list may not be quite accurate; it is easy to overlook cases of change, or lack of change, in reading so large a work, though I have been fairly careful, and do not think that a second reading would change them much.

²The infinitive form is put in this list, but all forms of the verb are included in the subjoined number.

³The proportionately large number of occurrences of *purrh* in this list will surprise no one who has noticed what frequent use Orrmin makes of this preposition. The number is made much larger, of course, by including all verbs compounded with *purrh*, many of which are of very frequent use.

The third list comprises those words that are subject to the change under discussion. I have taken no note of the number of occurrences, but the total cannot fall much below two thousand.¹ The words are the following:

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| 1. <i>pa</i> | (those) after <i>t</i> or <i>d</i> , <i>ta</i> . |
| 2. <i>pa</i> | (then) " " " , <i>ta</i> . |
| 3. <i>paer</i> | (where) " " " , <i>taer</i> . |
| 4. <i>paere</i> | (there) " " " , <i>taere</i> . |
| 5. <i>panne</i> | (then) " " " , <i>tanne</i> . |
| 6. <i>patt</i> | (that) " " " , <i>tatt</i> . |
| 7. <i>pe</i> | (the) " " " , <i>te</i> . |
| 8. <i>pe</i> | (thee) " " " , <i>te</i> . |
| 9. <i>pepen</i> | (thence) " " " , <i>tepen</i> . |
| 10. <i>pezz</i> | (they) " " " , <i>tezz</i> . |
| 11. <i>pezzre</i> | (their) " " " , <i>tezzre</i> . |
| 12. <i>pi</i> | (thy) " " " , <i>ti</i> . |
| 13. <i>pin</i> | (thine) " " " , <i>tin</i> . |
| 14. <i>piderr</i> | (thither) " " " , <i>tiderr</i> . |
| 15. <i>piss</i> | (this) " " " , <i>tiss</i> . |
| 16. <i>pohh</i> | (though) " " " , <i>tohh</i> . |
| 17. <i>pu</i> | (thou) " " " , <i>tu</i> . |
| 18. <i>puss</i> | (thus) " " " , <i>tuss</i> . |

One who has noticed the different character of the words in this list and in the preceding one can, no doubt, formulate for himself the rule of Orrmin's usage in the treatment of initial *p*. It is this:—

Initial p of pronominal words becomes t after t or d; initial p of other words remains unchanged.

To the second part of this rule I have found no exceptions whatever; to the first part I have found but two out of about two thousand cases, as estimated above. *patt* stands unchanged after *t* in verse 15 of the Dedication, *Afterr patt little witt patt me*, and *pa* after *d* in verse 15,576 of the Homilies, *patt taer wass filledd pa purrh himm*. The first of these occurs in a couplet² which Orrmin, with a modest estimate of his abilities, is fond of repeating before attempting the exposition of a Scripture passage which he has quoted. The same couplet occurs repeatedly,³ and always, except in the

¹ There are eighty cases in the first thousand verses, and these words seem to be less frequent in the Introduction and Dedication than in the Homilies.

² *Afterr patt little witt patt me Min Drihhtin hafepp lenedd*.

³ E. g. vv. 4386-87; vv. 5158-59; vv. 6390-91, &c.

first case, with the reading *witt tatt*. The second case also occurs in a verse which we find repeated¹ farther on with the usual change of *p* to *t*. One exception in a thousand cases is certainly not a large number, and it does not seem a very violent hypothesis, in view of the repetition of these verses in the normal form, if we assume that both the cases are simply oversights on the part of the author or the scribe.

The limitation of the rule of this change to pronominal words disposes of all the exceptions given in White's preface. These pronominal words are not used as the second part of compounds, and other words suffer no such change either in composition or elsewhere. In speaking of the metrical point, White seems to have in mind the old alliterative poetry, with the regular division of each verse by a caesura, marked in the MSS. by a point. But the metre of the Ormulum is utterly unlike that of those poems, and White has himself printed the Ormulum, not in long verses with a caesural mark, but in couplets. There can be no doubt, I think, that this is the proper form, and there is therefore no need of adding an exception to cover such cases. The rule applies only to words in the same verse; an initial *p* at the beginning of a verse, whether it be the first or second verse of the couplet, is not affected by the ending of the preceding verse. White's third exception is especially unfortunate in the citation of *pu* as an illustration, and in implying, as it seems to do, that the influence of a following *u* sometimes prevents the change of *p* to *t*. The only pronominal words in which initial *p* is followed by *u* are *pu* and *puss*, and both are regularly changed, after *d* or *t*, to *tu* and *tuss*; all others remain unaffected. The frequency of *purrh*, no doubt, suggested the exception. To White's note on *pess te bett* and the like, nothing need be added. These phrases are found twenty-five times in the Ormulum, and always in the same form, with *pess te*, never with *pess pe*.

The above list of words subject to the change of initial *p* to *t* after *t* or *d* comprises all the pronominal words of the Ormulum except *pezzm*. As the other cases of this word, *pezz* and *pezzre*, are regularly changed to *tezz* and *tezzre*, the non-occurrence of *pezzm* after *t* or *d*, and consequent lack of a form *tezzm*, is apparently intentional, and seems to deserve an explanation.

¹ v. 16,128. *patt taer wass filledd ta purrh Crist. vv. 15,574-15,581* are, with one or two verbal changes, the same as *vv. 16,126-16,133*.

No student of Old English need be told that the language once had a regularly formed plural of the pronoun *he* in the forms *hi*, *her*, *hem*;¹ and that *they*, *their*, *them*, which has now replaced the regular forms, is the plural of a demonstrative pronoun, which has also furnished us the article *the* and the pronoun *that*. A peculiar circumstance of this crowding out of *hi* by *they* is the fact that all cases did not give way to the newcomer at once. The nominative *hi* was the first to yield; *her* held its own against *their* for some time after *hi* had given way, and *hem* lasted still longer; in fact, one may safely assert that it yet survives, for the 'em of common speech is only a clipped form of it, and but for the law of usage in writing would be as legitimate a form as the similarly mutilated *it* for the regular *hit*. This difference in the power of resistance of the different cases of *he* does not seem to have been a local or dialectical matter, though the date of the change was different in different localities. In the Vision of Piers Plowman (ed. Skeat) I find

<i>hii</i> ,	7 times,	-	<i>pei</i> ,	85 times.
<i>her</i> ,	104 "	-	<i>peire</i> ,	1 time.
<i>hem</i> ,	195 "	-	(<i>them</i> ,	0 ")

In Pierce the Ploughman's Crede (ed. Skeat) the occurrences of these pronouns are

<i>hy</i> ,	7 times,	-	<i>pei</i> ,	94 times.
<i>her</i> ,	75 "	-	(<i>their</i> ,	0 ")
<i>hem</i> ,	65 "	-	(<i>them</i> ,	0 ")

These figures show that *they* had, about A. D. 1350, nearly crowded out *hi*, while *their* had scarcely got a foothold and *them* none at all. In the Ormmulum, though it was evidently written at least a century earlier, this tendency has gone still further. *Hi* has altogether disappeared; *their* is well established and already getting the better of *her*; while *them*, although it has secured a foothold, is still far behind *hem*. The occurrences of these pronouns in the first three thousand verses of the poem are

(<i>hi</i> ,	0 times);	<i>pezz</i> ,	63 times.
<i>heore</i> ,	17 "	; <i>pezzre</i> ,	29 "
<i>hemm</i> ,	69 "	; <i>pezzm</i> ,	10 "

We see in these figures a marked preference of the writer for *hemm*, and an examination of the places where *pezzm* is found in-

¹ I give only one form, though various other spellings are found.

stead proves that he uses the latter only for metrical reasons. In the whole poem *pezzm* is found but forty-seven times, and in each case it stands after a vowel which is needed to make the verse regular, but, by Orrmin's system of metre, would be elided before a following *hemm*. After consonants *hemm* is always used, and *pezzm*, being therefore never brought into a position to suffer the change under discussion, has no corresponding form *tezzm*.

A discussion of the phonetic cause of this change includes three distinct topics: (*a*) the change of *p* to *t* after *t*; (*b*) the change of *p* to *t* after *d*; (*c*) the change of *p* to *t* after *s* in the phrases *þess te bett*, &c. The latter seems to be a case of simple dissimilation to avoid the difficulty of uttering a sound like *p* twice in close succession in words so closely joined in pronunciation; the change is due, therefore, not to the preceding *s* but to the initial *p* of *þess*. A like dissimilation is seen in Greek, where *λόθη-τι* stands for *λόθη-θι*, and a still better illustration is found in German, where for the older *des diu* we find in the Nibelungen Lied *deste* (Mod. Germ. *desto*), which has undergone the same phonetic dissimilation as *þess te*, to which it etymologically corresponds.

The change of *p* to *t* after *t*, on the contrary, is a case of assimilation, and would be a very simple matter in word-formation, but such tendencies do not usually find play when words have no closer connection than that of juxtaposition. This assimilation of initial *p* to a preceding *t* is not peculiar to the Ormmulum, however; I have noticed it in *Piers Plowman*,¹ in Chaucer, and elsewhere, but it is generally confined to particular words which coalesce with the preceding word in pronunciation and often in writing. It seems, in fact, to be the result of a sort of *enclisis*, which attaches the following word to the preceding one, thus depriving it of its separate accent and rendering it more liable to change of form. The words most subject to this sort of inclination are the article *the* and the personal pronoun *thou*. In the Nibelungen Lied there are numer-

¹ foughten atte ale.

Piers Plow. Prol. 42.

And seide "Sone slepestow, sestow þis poeple,"

Ibid. Pass. I, 5.

woldestow glase þat gable,

Ibid. Pass. III, 49.

And wel we weren esud atte beste.

Ch. Prol. Cant. Tales, 29.

And wend have hit this Aleyn atte ful.

Ibid. Reeve's Tale, 385.

ous cases of it,¹ and in the Low German *Reinaert*² it is carried so far as to become a special peculiarity of the language. In all these cases the second word, being enclitically attached to the foregoing and losing its separate accent, is rendered more liable to change; not only to the simple change of assimilation, but often to loss of some of its elements, as in the instances given in the notes. The personal pronoun *thou* is especially subject, in Old English, to this tendency to inclination, when it stands immediately after the verb. *Schaltu, artu, dostu, nostu, wepestu*³ and the like, are met with often. The article *the* is often thus attached to the preposition *at*, but other cases seem rare. I have met with none except in the *Ormmulum* and in one or two other works which bear a close resemblance to it in peculiarities of dialect, and are believed to have been produced in the same neighborhood.⁴

The works that bear the greatest likeness to the *Ormmulum* are the poem of *Genesis* and *Exodus* and the *Bestiary*. Both these have been edited by Rev. Richard Morris for the Early English Text Society, and a careful catalogue of the peculiarities of dialect common to them with the *Ormmulum* forms a part of his preface to the former work. In this list one point of resemblance mentioned is "the change of an initial *ð* (th) into *t* after words ending in *d, t, n, s*, that is to say, after a dental or a sibilant." Mr. Morris cites five cases of this change in *Genesis* and *Exodus*; one after *s*, one after *t*, and three after *d*; and adds, "This practice is more frequent in the *Bestiary*." In the preface to his edition of the *Bestiary*, he refers the reader to his edition of *Genesis* and *Exodus* for a discussion of the former's dialectic peculiarities.

To the five cases cited by Mr. Morris from *Genesis* and *Exodus* may be added *redes tu* (2934), and *saltu* (2941), but these seven

¹E. g. *imme* (=in deme), 361, 3; *müesen lip* (=müese den lip), 455, 4, &c. The Modern Germ. *am* (=an dem), *zum* (=zu dem), and the like, are instances of the same tendency.

²E. g. *ter* (=te der), 150; *ten* (=te den), 322; *int* (=in dat), 3612; *dattu* (=dat du), 2879; *bistu* (=bist du), 4049, &c.

³I. e. *shalt thou, art thou, dost thou, knowest thou, wepest thou*. This position of the pronoun is common in statements as well as in questions.

⁴In *An Old English Miscellany*, edited by Mr. Morris for the Early English Text Society, I find (not counting the "*Bestiary*," which I have considered by itself) thirty-four cases of *thou* attached to its verb in the manner mentioned, but only three of *the*, and in all these the other MS. gives the unchanged form. They are all after *at*, viz. *atte* and *at þe*, *Doomsday*, 31; *atten* and *at þen*, *A lutel soth sermun*, 47; *aten* and *at þon*, *ibid.* 91. There are also two cases of *tu* (=thou) after *þat*, and one of *ti* (=thy) after *mit*.

cases are all I have noticed, though initial *p* occurs in the poem nearly seven hundred times after the letters¹ mentioned. One case of change in a hundred certainly bears little likeness to the systematic and regular change in the Orrmulum. However close its resemblance to the latter may be in other respects, it may be left out of account in discussing the change under consideration. The instances it furnishes are not more numerous than in other works which do not belong to the same dialect and did not originate in the same neighborhood.

In the Bestiary, as Mr. Morris remarks, the change is far more frequent, being made in a majority² of the cases, but differs from the usage of the Orrmulum in two important points. One is the change of *p* to *t* after *s*, which takes place in the Orrmulum only after *þess* in the phrases mentioned, while in the Bestiary, where these phrases are not found, the change to *t* takes place after the verb *is* and the possessive case of nouns. It is evident that the cause of the change here, be it what it may, is entirely different from that which has produced *þess te* in the phrases given. This change can hardly be counted among the points in which the Bestiary resembles the Orrmulum.

Again, in the Bestiary the writer seems to have changed the initial *p*, or left it unchanged, at random, while in the Orrmulum it is apparent, I think, that the author had a definite rule in mind which he systematically followed. This difference seems to me fundamental, and the two works can be brought into harmony of usage on this point only by assuming that the Bestiary has suffered in transcription by a later scribe. But in the absence of all evidence on the subject, we have no right to make such an assumption.

¹It would seem that the insertion of *n* in Mr. Morris' list of letters after which *p* is subject to the change to *t* is a mere oversight. I have found no instance of such a change after *n* in the Orrmulum, nor in the other books compared with it, though I noted between thirty and forty cases of initial *p* after *n* in the Bestiary, and nearly three hundred in Genesis and Exodus, nearly all of which are in pronominal words.

²In the Bestiary initial *p* becomes *t* after *t*, 15 times; remains unchanged, 5 times; becomes *t* after *d*, 15 times; remains unchanged, 5 times; becomes *t* after *s*, 12 times; remains unchanged, 7 times. I have carefully classified both the preceding and following words in all these cases, but have failed to detect any rule of change. The words most often changed are *þe* and *þu*, and the words after which the change takes place oftenest are *þat*, *and*, and *is*, but this seems to be a merely natural result of the greater frequency of these words.

If we consider the change of *p* to *t* after *t* as a case of assimilation, as seems natural, we are, nevertheless, at once involved in difficulty when we take up the question of the same change after *d*. The law of assimilation, unaffected by any other influence, should surely change *p* into *d* in this case. The change of English *th* into *d* is the invariable result of the efforts of children and foreigners to articulate it, and if, as is generally assumed, words beginning with *th* had the same initial sound five or six centuries ago as they now have, it seems strange that the result of bringing *d* and *p* together should be a combination so difficult to articulate as *dt*, when a simple and natural assimilation¹ would produce a much easier combination. In studying the matter, the only solution that occurred to me was the supposition that final *d* may have had the sound of *t* at that time, as it now has in German and in many past participles in English. This hypothesis, apart from the lack of evidence, is at once met, however, by the fact of Orrmin's systematic carefulness in spelling, a point in which he stands alone among the old writers of English. I have no explanation to offer towards the solution of this difficulty.

In one respect all the works cited agree with the Orrmulum. This change of *p* to *t* occurs only in pronominal words; in other words I have found no instance of it anywhere. And this brings up the further question why the change should be limited to this class of words. If the Orrmulum were not in existence, and only the cases of change in the other works cited in this article were to be accounted for, I should be inclined to refer the whole matter to the influence of loss of accent by inclination,² as mentioned above. The pronominal words thus used are still pronounced without marked accent, while non-pronominal words are not so treated. Losing their accent and being thus rendered more liable to change, they weaken or assimilate the initial *p* under the influence of a preceding *t*, *d* or *s*, though independent words retain their individuality of pronunciation. The weakening or changing of sounds as

¹ In the Bestiary the final *p* of verb-endings is often united with a preceding *d* to *t*; e. g. *fint* (= *findeð*), 292; *bit* (= *biddeð*), 432; *hitt* (= *hideð*), 471, &c. Orrmin uses the full form in such verbs. In this article, however, I am not considering the treatment of medial or final *p*.

² All the words that I have met with subject to this change (except in the Orrmulum) are monosyllabic and unemphatic, except that *tanne* occurs once in the Bestiary. Perhaps even this should be *tan*. The form *pan* is quite as common in the work as *panne*.

a result of the shifting of accent is too common a phenomenon to require any discussion. The frequent habit of attaching these words to the preceding ones, as in *atte*, *sestow*, &c., shows that the writers combined them in pronunciation with the foregoing word rather than with the following one, and the modification of *tp* and *sp* into *tt* and *st* is the natural result of this partial union of two words into one. The change of *dp* into *dt*, where we should expect *dd*, involves a difficulty mentioned before, which would be explained, perhaps, if we could be sure of the sound given to *dt* in such cases.

This theory of inclination is not weakened by the fact that the change takes place more frequently in some works than others, and that it seems to be a matter of fancy with the writers whether the proper form or the weakened form be employed, for such inconsistencies are the result, in all languages, of the compromise between the written and the spoken form of a word, and illustrations could be cited by the hundred from modern English. But the theory fails at once when applied to the Orrmulum. Such words as *tepenmforrþ* and *tohhwheþpre* cannot be explained by inclination, nor can the numerous cases of change where the article *pe* combines with the following word by *proclisis*.¹ The difference of treatment in the case of pronominal words and others in the Orrmulum must rest on some other difference than that of accent, and this can be nothing else, I think, than a difference of sound. And when we remember that initial *th* has one sound now in all words of pronominal derivation and another sound in all other words, it is not hard to believe that the difference also existed in Orrmin's time, and was the basis of his different treatment of the two classes of words.

I am not qualified to express an opinion on the oft-debated question of the sound of *p* in the Saxon and Early English period. Mr. Sweet, after a study of the use of the two characters *p* and *ð*, as they stand in the MSS., maintains² that there was originally but one sound, that of *th* in *this*, and that frequency of use has caused the retention of this sound in the pronominal words, though

¹ E. g. *talde* (= *te alde*); *tallre* (= *te allre*), &c.

² In an appendix to his edition of Alfred's Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care, published by the Early Eng. Text Soc.

I have used the character *p* all through this article, although some of the works quoted use *ð*, others *p*; because clearness seemed to me of more value than exactness of form in quotation.

it has been changed in other words. Whether this opinion is true, and whether the cause assigned for the retention of the older sound in the words mentioned is a sufficient one, are questions with which I am not concerned in this article. Nor is it necessary to consider here what sound *medial* or *final* *p* may have had. Orrmin's usage seems to me to prove that about A. D. 1200, in the Midland district of England, two sounds of initial *p* were in existence, and that one of them was used, as is still the case, in all words of pronominal derivation; the other, in all other words. Whether these sounds were the same then as now is another question. Assuming, as we naturally do, that they were so, we come back to the same question in another form; why one sound of initial *p* should be more subject to change than the other.¹

The answer to this question may be found, I think, in what may be called the *formalism* of Orrmin's style. No one can read the Orrmulum without being struck with the great difference between the regularity of his grammar, metre and spelling, and the looseness of form in all other works of the period. I have already mentioned² his retention of the full ending in the verb where the writer of the Bestiary admits the less formal shortened form, and the whole of his grammar is equally regular. His exactness in spelling is well known, as is also the mechanical device he adopted of doubling a consonant to show the sound of the preceding vowel, and the earnestness with which he begs any one who may copy his work to write it after his model.³

" & whase wilenn shall þis boc
 Effþ oþerr siþe writenn,
 Himm bidde icc þatt hēt wriþe riht
 Swa summ þiss boc himm taecþeþþ,
 All þwerriþ ūt affterr þatt itt iss
 Upþo þiss firrste bisne,

¹ This question is discussed here with reference of course to the Orrmulum only, the cause of the change in all other works being, if my explanation be the true one, not the nature of the sound of initial *p*, but *inclination*, and its restriction to pronominal words a result of the fact that only those words are enclitically used.

² See note 1, p. 54. His retention of the full participial ending *-edd* and his use of *þær* as relative and *þære* as demonstrative, though both are forms of the same word, are other illustrations.

³ Orrmin seems to have met with the experience of most reformers in having no imitators. There is no proof that any one ever copied his book with his spelling or any other.

Wipp all swillc rime alls her iss sett,
 Wipp all se fele wordess
 & tatt he loke wel patt he
 An bocstaff write twi33ess
 E33whaer paer it uppo piss boc
 Iss writenn o patt wise.
 Loke he well patt hēt write swa,
 Forr he ne ma33 nohht elless
 Onn Ennglissh writtenn rihht te word,
 patt wite he wel to sope."

Dedication, 95-110.

I have written out this passage in full because, while showing his carefulness in spelling and the emphasis he lays on the necessity of writing "a letter twice" wherever he has done so, it also illustrates the formal regularity of his metre. Each verse has a fixed number of syllables, and a final vowel is as regularly elided before a vowel or *h* as in Latin poetry. In the whole poem I have found but one verse that drew my attention by being lame in metre. His formalism extends also to the arrangement and handling of his subject matter, and is, in fact, the essential part of his style.

To the same cause I am inclined to refer his formal regularity in the treatment of initial *p*. The assimilation of *p* to a preceding *t*, and its weakened pronunciation after *d* and *s*, can be explained in all other works as the result of a kind of inclination, treated of and illustrated above. Orrmin, finding most pronominal words subject to this change, treated it as a matter of euphony or spelling, and extended the usage to all words beginning with the same sound of *p*, allowing no exceptions, but carrying his system of regularity into this as into everything else.¹

I cannot deny that this theory is open to the charge of being labored and artificial. But Orrmin is not by any means the only person who has attempted to make rules of grammar, and the assumption that he did so in this case is supported by his artificial regularity in other things. I am quite ready to accept any other theory of this change that will better account for the facts of his usage. Until a better one is brought forward, the conclusions I have reached, after studying the matter, are these:

¹ The fact that Orrmin does not change *p* to *t* after *s* (except in *pess te*) is no objection to the explanation offered. The change after *s* was unusual; I have found it only in the Bestiary and two or three times in Genesis and Exodus. Regularity was therefore secured in this case by making no change at all in *p* when it followed *s*.

1. That in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the two sounds of initial *th* were already in existence as they now are, and in the same words.

2. That monosyllabic words of pronominal derivation were subject to a weakening and assimilation of the initial *th* sound to *t* after *d* and *t*, less often after *s*; the result of a kind of inclination and consequent loss of accent.

3. That the extension of this change to all pronominal words in the *Orrmulum* is artificial and the result of the author's desire for regularity; a desire shown also in his grammar, spelling and metre.

F. A. BLACKBURN.

V.—ON BENTLEY'S ENGLISH MSS. OF TERENCE.

Every student of Terence has reason to be grateful to Umpfenbach for his industry in collecting manuscript materials, and for making generally accessible the critical apparatus for the study of so important an author. But although scarce a decade has passed since the appearance of his edition, the need of some more exhaustive work, with more complete and accurate collations, and a sharper discrimination between the three families of Terence MSS. which Umpfenbach was the first to distinguish, has already made itself felt. At least, if the study of Terence is to keep pace with that of Plautus, there is an urgent demand for more of the *ἀκριβεία* displayed by Ritschl in his judicious management of manuscript material. Ritschl's revised edition of the *Trinummus*, and the recent edition of the *Asinaria* by his enthusiastic pupils, Goetz and Loewe, may serve as specimens of what painstaking and loving devotion to an author can accomplish. It may be doubted whether it would be possible to edit any one play of Terence as carefully with the materials furnished by Umpfenbach. I say this in no spirit of harsh censure. Defects there must be in any first undertaking of this sort, and for many of these Umpfenbach, who was obliged to delegate much of the work of collation to others, is not directly responsible. From personal examination I can only speak of the collation of the *Parisinus*, which to me is unsatisfactory. It was made by August Fritsch just before the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war, at a time when it behooved every loyal German to turn his back on Paris and put himself at the service of 'Vaterland.' At such a juncture patriotism may pardon the dropping of a few *i*'s, and some things are worth more than even a good collation. But as Paris is no longer in a state of siege, and as the *Parisinus* is the leading representative of the pure Calliopian recension, I think we ought to have an exact record of its readings, and even slight *orthographica* may be of service in determining its relation to other MSS., as for instance the *Dunelmensis*.

To substantiate my strictures, I may be allowed to cite here my own readings of the *Parisinus* in some passages of the *Andria*,

where Umpfenbach's collation is either incomplete or incorrect. v. 63 *isse sededere* (sic). 79 *dehinc* DEG. 122 *Visa ē & quia erat forma præter ceteras* on the margin, but by P¹ cf. G. 232 *dii*. 242 *quoniamme* G. 257 *ommutui* P¹ *obm.* P². 276 *vereor* B cf. D. Klotz keeps *vereor*, but gives *verear* as the reading of P. 289 *dexteram* & (sic) cf. C. 301 *hodie* om. 338 *Dii*. 349 *ducas tu illam* (not *nullam*). 386 *hac* D. 393 *mutet* P¹ no correction. 458 *em illic* P¹ corrected to *illec* P². 586 *habeo iam* (*tibi* om. as in C¹). Bentley, Fleckeisen, Klotz, and Spengel all omit *tibi*. 627 *gaudea*||t cf. B. *n* probably erased. 665 *factum est hoc*—Bentley's reading. 786 *hinc* om. cf. C. 801 *Crysidis*. 813 *amicum ac*. 816 *dispoliare*. 836 *omnia* omitted at end of verse. 841 *tibi sã oble^{et}*; *e* changed to *i* and ' added by corrector cf. DG. 857 *tristis veritas* cf. C. 895 *At tandem dicat sine*. 915 *arbitrare* BC. 922 *ego* om. BC. 957 *forsitam* = A. Not all of these are important variants, but their omission or misstatement detracts from the trustworthiness of an edition which some persons seem to regard as final, and leads us to suspect that the same inaccuracy may characterize the collations of the MSS. of the DG family. I turn now to consider the MSS. used by Bentley. Not many of these certainly can compare in value with the Parisinus or the Victorianus; yet if fully known, they might supplement our knowledge of the readings of both families and cast some light on the text-history of Terence. As every thorough teacher and editor of Terence has to concern himself more or less with Bentley's¹ readings and numerous emendations, it must be admitted that the use of Bentley's commentary would be rendered vastly more satisfactory did we know in each instance his MS. authority and what value to set upon it. One tires of reading *unus ex nostris, duo tantum ex nostris, duo primarii, noster veterrimus*, etc. etc., even though we may be sure that Bentley did not, like some early editors, invent MS. readings to suit his own convenience. Towards the settlement of this question, owing to the enforced shortness of my stay in England, I cannot promise to do much. My main object in this paper will be to definitely determine what were the Regii codices used by Bentley. Umpfenbach in an article, which forms

¹I find that Umpfenbach makes respectful mention of Bentley's reading in over 200 passages, and in over 100 he accepts it, for the most part against the tradition of all the principal MSS. Fleckeisen's dependence upon Bentley would probably be found to be still greater.

a valuable supplement to his edition, (Philologus, vol. 32, pp. 442-477) on the MSS. of Terence quoted by Lindenbrog, Leng and Bentley, gives, on pp. 461 f., a list of the passages in which Bentley quotes one or more of the *codd. Regii*. Had Umpfenbach been able to examine these *codices* himself, my labor would have been spared; but the scanty collations furnished him by Dr. Buff were insufficient to enable him to arrive at exact conclusions, and he himself has been over-hasty in assigning to the *Regius chartaceus* readings which are not actually found in it. According to the catalogue of the British Museum, the Terence MSS. belonging to the Bibliotheca Regia are as follows: 8 D XVII Terentii Andreae (sic) folia 4, saec. xv. 15 A VIII Pub. Terentii Afri Comoediae. Deficiunt in scen. I, Actus tertii Phormionis. saec. xi. 15 B VIII Pub. Terentii Afri Comoediae. saec. xv. 15 A XI In charta. saec. xv. 15 A XII P. Ter. Afri Comoediae. saec. x. Catalogues, however, are not to be implicitly trusted, and 8 D XVII, instead of containing a portion of the Andria alone, as Umpfenbach following the catalogue states, contains parts of the Andria, Eunuchus and Hautontimorumenos. To be more explicit, fol. 1 begins with Sulpicius Apollinaris' Argument to the Andria, *Sororem falso*, etc., the last verse of which is thus given, *Agnitam hanc Pamphilo dat, aliam carino coniuges*. Then follows the Prologue with the beginning of the Andria as far as the words *qui postquam* (I 2, 6). Fol. 2 begins with *michi illam lauda* (Eun. V 8, 23), and gives in col. 1 the remainder of the Eunuchus. Col. 2 gives the Prologue of Haut. and two lines of the Didascalia. The reverse of fol. 2 gives four more lines of Didascalia, the Argument to Haut., and Act. I, Sc. 1, as far as the words *nec vas* v. 89. Fol. 3, which bears the number 76, begins with *audierat* (And. I 2, 6) and ends with *excelsum locum* (And. II 2, 19). Fol. 4 numbered 76 begins with *neque ita imperita* (Eun. V 2, 42) and closes with *fautrix familie* (Eun. V 8, 22). Thus it will be seen that fol. 76 forms the continuation of fol. 1, and fol. 2 of fol. 77. The orthography is poor, the text corrupt, and I could find no evidence of this fragment having been consulted by Bentley. On the other hand, he does quote from each of the four remaining Regii. In the majority of cases he does so to support his emendation of the text, but it can now be shown that at a later period he abandoned many of these emendations, and either restored the former reading or proposed some new change. The British Museum contains, under No. 833 K 13, Bentley's private

copy of his own edition of Terence, Cambridge, 1726. The catalogue has the following brief statement in regard to it: "MS. notes by Bentley. Imperfect, wanting all but the 2d title-page, and the text of Terence. Probably bound up in this form by Bentley for annotation." The system of critical signs is the same employed by him in his marginal annotations of other authors. See especially Schroeder's "Richard Bentley's Emendationen zum Plautus," and Sonnenschein Appendix to Ed. of Captivi, pp. 65 f.¹ These marginal notes, which are quite numerous, I have copied, and shall give here in the foot-notes such as bear directly upon the passage in which Bentley quotes the *Regii*. *Regius* 15 A VIII is referred to by him, either as *ex Regiis unus*, *Regius unus*, or simply *Regius* in twelve passages, viz. And. 928, Eun. 302, 942, Haut. 271, 282, 317, 649, 877, 883, 931, Phorm. 182, 229. This MS. closes with the words *unam ut audio*, Phorm. III 1, 19 (483), after which verse only three *Regii* are cited. In nine out of these twelve passages Bentley adopted the reading of this *cod.* against the authority of older MSS., but in no case has his change been accepted by recent editors, and in four of the most important passages he himself saw fit afterwards to adopt another reading. This *cod.*, therefore, hardly seems to deserve any further notice. For particulars see Note I.

¹Sonnenschein is wrong, I think, in supposing that the marginal tick (+) used by Bentley indicates approval. He says that it is placed over *equidem*, Epid. IV 2, 33, where *dicebant* follows. Is it not rather clear that, as Bentley changed *equidem* to *quidem* in Men. 309, 551, Mil. 656, Poen. 1229, Rud. 827, where the verb is not in the first person, so he meant to change it here?

NOTE I.—In the notes I shall give the passages cited above according to the continuous numbering of the play, in the same order, according to act and scene, as was Bentley's custom. For Bentley's own statement and text I must refer the reader to his edition. My own readings I give in this order, (1) The reading of the special *Regius* under discussion; (2) the reading of the other *Regii*; where all differ, with special designation of each; (ϕ = reliqui); (3) the marginal notes or corrections, if any, of Bentley cited as By². And. V 4, 25 (1) 15 A VIII *nomen tam cito? Phania*. (2) ϕ *nomen tam cito tibi phania* (or *fania*) (3) By² CR. *nomen tam cito tibi?—hem.* v. 26 *Perdidi, verum hercle*, etc., with a reference to Phorm. II 3, 39. *Certo* in verse 26 is underscored and deleted (for metrical reasons). Eun. II 3, 11 (1) *qui hodie me* (2) 15 B VIII *me qui hodie ϕ qui me hodie* (3) By² reads *Ut illum di deaque omnes perdant qui me hodie remoratus est*, with a marginal reference to Men. IV 2, 31 and Rud. IV 4, 122, both of which have *di omnes*. Eun. V 4, 20 (1) *ut ne impune nos illuseris* (2) ϕ *in nos illuseris*.

15 B VIII is quoted by Bentley in twenty-two passages, viz. And. 253, 305, 352, 610, Eun. 716, 954, 1022, Haut. 354, 796, 924, Ad. 105, 259, Hec. 286, 797, Phorm. 356, 481, 497, 530, 533, 689, 1011, 1054. In fifteen of these passages Bentley based his own reading upon this manuscript. In six passages, however, he afterwards withdrew his own emendation in favor of another, see Note II. In four passages, viz. Haut. 796, Ad. 259,

Haut. II 3, 30 (1) ^{hoc} *ex ipsa in itinere* (sic) (2) *φ hoc ipsa in itinere*. 41, (1) *nam ea tum res dedit* (2) *φ nam ea res dedit tum*. II 3, 76 (1) *si sinas dico* (2) *φ si sinas dicam*. IV 1, 36 (1) *eloquere* (2) *φ loquere*. V 1, 4 (1) *quæ st dictæ* (sic) (2) *φ dicta*. V 1, 10 (1) *Ehem per tempus Menedeme advenis* (2) *φ omit per tempus* (3) By² deletes *per tempus* and inserts *Chreme* (with A) after *homines*. 58, (1) *illi^c* (sic) *i* changed to *e* (2) *φ illec* or *illec*. Phorm. I 4, 5 (1) the interpolated verse *Quæ si, etc.*, follows *extraham* (2) in *φ* it follows *audacia*. 51, (1) *subsidiis* = DG (2) *φ insidiis* (3) By² underscores *sub* with marginal tick.

NOTE II.—And. I 5, 18 (1) 15 B VIII *Tantum^{us} rem* (sic) (2) *φ tantamne rem*. II 1, 5 (1) *quando* (2) *quoniam* (3) By² substitutes *ut quoniam* for *quando* with a marginal reference to And. III 2, 7 where *ut* follows *quaeso*. II 2, 15 (1) *tibi uxorem non dat iam* (2) 15 A XII *uxorem tibi non dat iam φ uxorem non dat tibi iam* (3) By² substitutes *suam gnatum* for *uxorem* putting it before *tibi* and deletes *iam*. III 5, 4 (1) *id numquam a me auferet* (2) 15 A XII *id numquam feret φ id numquam auferet* (3) By² has a caret after *ego* with *ergo* (sic) on the margin, *a me* is then underscored and would no doubt have been omitted by Bentley in a second edition. Eun. IV 4, 47 (1) *eo oi hei* (2) 15 A VIII *oi ei* 15 A XI *oi ei hei*. V 4, 32 (1) *ubi rescivit* (2) *φ ubi id rescivit*. V 6, 21 (1) *et eundem patri indicas* (2) 15 A XII *et eundem^{patri} indicas* (sic) *φ omit patri* (3) By² *et eum idem indicas*. Haut. II 3, 113 (1) *minor res mea* (2) *φ minor mea res* (3) By² reads *Quasi hic minus mea res agatur* (the *a* of *agatur* is underscored). A has *minor mea res* but the edd. following Bentley and Guyet read *res mea minor*. IV 5, 48 (1) *summa est malitia* = A (2) *φ summa malitia est*. V 1, 51 (1) *Quid vis faciam* (2) *φ Quid faciam*. Ad. I 2, 25 (1) *duces* (2) *φ ducis*. II 3, 6 (1) *nemini*=ADG (2) *φ neminem*. Hec. III 1, 6 (1) *omnibus nobis* (2) 15 A VIII *nobis omnibus φ nos omnes*. V. 2, 31 (1) *nactam* (2) *natam*. Phorm. II 3, 9 (1) the spurious verse *Nec Stilphonem* etc. follows v. 25. III 1, 17 (1) *velle sese* (2) *φ sese velle*. III 2, 12 (1) *esse te duro* (2) 15 A XII *esse duro (te om.) φ te esse duro* (3) By² *ingenio esse duro te* (sic). III 2, 45 (1) *iste* = A (2) *φ is*. III 2, 48 (1) *sit potior* (2) *φ potior sit*. IV 4, 8 (1) *qui te ad scopulum e tranquillo auferat* (2) 15 A XI *quod recte curatum velis qui te ad scopulum In^e tranquillo auferat* (sic) 15 A XII *quod quidem recte curatum velis qui te ad scopulum e tranquillo afferat* (sic). V 9, 22 (1) *cum isto* (2) *cum hoc ipso*. V 9, 65 (1) *fiat* is given to Nausistrata (2) 15 A XII Chr. *fiat* 15 A XI Pho. *ffiat* (sic).

Phorm. 530 and 1054, the reading of 15 B VIII coincides with that of the Bembinus. In Phorm. 530 where according to Umpfenbach BCDEFGP all have *is* for *iste* of A, this coincidence is quite remarkable, and a collation of this MS. for that part of the And. where the Bembinus is wanting may perhaps be thought desirable. It is noteworthy too that in Phorm. IV 4, 8, 15 B VIII has only *qui te ad scopulum e tranquillo auferat*, which is not found at all in most of the leading MSS. and in E and F only on the margin, although it has been accepted by the editors as the more fitting close of the verse, *quod quidem recte curatum velis* being regarded as a gloss derived from Ad. III 3, 18 (372).

I now come to consider 15 A XI. Umpfenbach in the article above referred to (p. 461) has pointed out that this is the MS. quoted by Bentley in And. I 1, 59, IV 5, 3, Eun. IV 6, 7, Ad. V 8, 29, where he calls it *chartaceus sed ex optimo exemplari transcriptus*, and in And. V 1, 17, Eun. V 2, 17, Haut. I 2, 2, Hec. III 3, 7, V 2, 2 and 24 where he calls it simply *chartaceus*. I have taken pains to verify in all these passages the readings, and they correspond with those given by Bentley, except that in And. I 1, 59, 15 A XI has *Phedriam* for *Phaedrum*. Out of these ten passages only two readings have been generally accepted, viz. And. V 1, 17 *facta* = D, Hec. V 2, 24 *At haec amicae* = A. But in addition there are fourteen other passages where Bentley refers to this MS. designating it vaguely as *codex Regius, unus ex Regiis, alter Regius*, etc., viz. And. 438, Eun. 104, 222, Haut. 798 Ad. 337, 343, 561, 588, Hec. 468, 623, Phorm. 360, 598, 803, 818. see Note III. In ten of these passages Bentley bases his own reading on this

NOTE III.—And. II 6, 7 (1) 15 A XI *hec sunt nuptiae hę* || D edd. (2) ϕ *hae*. Eun. I 2, 24 (1) *Sin falsum aut vacuum aut vanum est* (2) 15 A XII *sin falsum aut vanum aut fictum est* so 15 B VIII and 15 A VIII, except that the latter has *factum*. II 1, 16 (1) *hercle est haec* (2) ϕ *hercle haec est*. Haut. IV 5, 50 (1) *bene aucta* edd. (2) ϕ *bene acta* (3) By² sets a tick on the margin with a reference to Phorm. V 3, 5 where *parta* occurs. Ad. III 2, 39 (1) *an proferendum hoc tibi videtur usquam* (2) 15 B VIII *an hoc proferendum esse videtur usquam* ϕ *an hoc proferendum tibi videtur esse usquam* (3) By² underscores *hoc*. III 2, 45 (1) *Quid ais?* (2) 15 B VIII *quid ages?* which Bentley may refer to in *unus ex nostris* ϕ *Quid agis?* IV 2, 22 (1) *aibas* edd. (2) 15 A VIII *agebas* ϕ *aiebas*. IV 2, 49 (1) *otiosus* (2) 15 A XII *otiose* cf. G ϕ *odiose*. Hec. III 5, 18 (1) *audivi modo* edd. (2) ϕ *audivi omnia modo*. IV 4, 1 (1) *iratus edepol sum* (2) ϕ *edepol sum iratus*. Phorm. II 3, 13 (1) *o audacia* (sic), *etiamne* (2) ϕ *etiam me*. IV 2, 8 (1) *amicum se esse* (2) ϕ *amicum esse*. V 3, 20 (1) *cave in* (2) ϕ *cave ne in*. V 3, 35 (1) *satis tutus hic est* (2) ϕ *satis tutus est* (3) By² *satis tutus ad narrandum est hic*.

MS., but in only four cases has it been adopted by recent editors, viz. And. 438 *haec* = D, Haut. 798 *Aucta*, Ad. 561 *aibas*, Hec. 468 *audivi modo*. In the last three passages 15 A XI agrees with no other MS. Bentley seems to have set a high value upon its readings, and perhaps a careful collation would bring to light many choice variants, but I seriously doubt it. Umpfenbach, who had hoped to establish for it a close relationship to DG, admits his disappointment, based upon the result of a collation of Eun. Prol. and I 1 and 2 (see l. d. pp. 463 f.).¹ He says, "Nur wenige von diesen lesarten bekunden abhängigkeit von der familie DG. Weit aus in den meisten steht die handschrift allein und nicht zu ihrem vorthail." On p. 462 he had said, "Zu dem schluss dass der Regius (chartaceus) der familie DG wenigstens sehr nahe stehe berechtigten übereinstimmungen wie And. I 5, 58 *haec te* (DG), II 1, 20 *ad auxiliandum* (D), II 6, 7 *haec* (*hē* || D), V 1, 17 *facta* (D), Haut. III 3, 15 *pudet* (ADG), IV 5, 48 *est malitia* (AG), Ad. II 1, 54 *hanc rationem* (DG), II 3, 6 *nemini* (AD), IV 1, 6 *nimis misere* (Donatus), 49 *otiosus* (*otiose* DG), V 9, 26 *pater mi* (DG), Pho. I 4 steht der interpolierte vers vor v. 4 wie in AD, III 2, 12 *esse duro te* (ADG), V 9, 65 NAV *fiat* (A. Donatus)." The circle of reasoning is a curious one. The *chartaceus* is the best of the *Regii*; *ergo* the readings agreeing with DG must be found in the *chart.*; *ergo* the *chart.* must belong to the DG family. As a matter of fact, in only three of the passages is the reading given found in the *chartaceus* (And. II 6 7, V 1, 7, Ad. IV 2, 49). In three passages 15 B VIII lays claim to it, in one 15 A VIII, see the several notes. Six of the readings, however, must be assigned to 15 A XII, which might accordingly assert its title to close relationship with DG. If the date assigned to it by the catalogue is correct, it is the oldest of the *Regii*, and it is the one most frequently cited by Bentley, viz. in some twenty-eight passages, And. 293, 320, 449, 542, Haut. 210, 221, 321, 571, 576, 753, 1002, 1051, Ad. 133, 194, 208, 522, 877, 907, 947, 983, Hec. 118, 178, 230, 735, 773, 861, Phorm. 238, 1028. Bentley adopted the reading of this MS. in seventeen passages, in eight of which he has been followed by recent editors, not however without the concurrence of other MSS. cf. And. 293, 542, Haut. 210, 221, 571, Ad. 983, Hec. 773,

¹ This collation requires the following corrections. In Eun. I 1, 25 15 A XI has *ei ultro* not *ultra ei*, I 2, 18 *exclisit*, not *exclusti*, 115 *oblectes* not *delectes*, 117 *forsitan* not *forsan*.

861, and note IV. A careful collation of this MS. which I have made for the Andria shows many points of agreement with DG, e. g. 101 *ut* om. D, 133 *amplectitur* G, 142 *attulit* D, 149 *nec hec* cf. D, 154 *Quis* CDG, 186 *me* om. G, 191 *sibi graviter* G, 205 *hoc dicas* D'G *haud* corr. rec., 276 *sit solo situm* G, 287 *res inutiles* DG, 362 *illoc* D, 398 *aliquid interea* D, 419 *timeo nre* cf. D, 420 *usquam erit* G, 427 *sibi esse melius malle* G, 477 *narras* D, 484 *ei* om. D, 495 *nunc hic se ipsus* cf. D, 508 *renuntio here* cf. DG, 549 *Quasi si* D, adopted by Spengel, so too Donatus, 551 *nisi* DEG, 604 *astutia* DEG, 621 *At non* D, 633 *cogit eos denegare* D, 720 *dolorem* DG, 726 *sume hinc* D, 766 *ego has semper* DG, 798 *vivere* DEG, 809 *eius dicta est* cf. D, 861 *intro hunc*

NOTE IV.—And. I 5, 58 (1) 15 A XII *sive haec te* DG (2) ϕ *sive te haec* (3) By² *si te istaec*. II 1, 20 (1) *ad auxiliandum* D (2) ϕ *auxili*. II 6, 18 (1) *Quid est? puerile est. Quidnam est?* (2) ϕ omit *nam*. III 3, 10 (1) *ita uti* G (2) ϕ *ita ut* (3) By² *ut ita hae nuptiae*. Haut. I 2, 36 (1) *quid ex usu siet* CE (2) ϕ *quod* etc. II 1, 9 (1) *quid ex usu siet*, so also 15 B VIII (2) ϕ *quod* etc. II 3, 80 (1) *hercle est*. Clit. *Quid est?* (2) 15 A VIII *hercle est tace* SY. *Quid est vis amare* 15 A XI *hercle est tace* CLIT. *Quid est?* SY. *Quid est? vis amare* 15 B VIII *Est hercle tace* SIR. *Quid est?* CLIN. *Quid est? vis amare?* III 3, 10 (1) *mi apud hunc fides*. Bentley says, "Lege cum uno ex Regio *At fides mi apud hunc est*," but in his commentary By² has corrected his statement thus *At fides mi apud hunc* which agrees with 15 A XII (2) ϕ *At mihi fides apud hunc* = A (3) By² underscores *mi* and reads *istius me* for *me istius*. III 3, 15 (1) *pudet* ADG (2) ϕ *piget*. IV 5, 5 (1) verse is missing, so E. V 2, 49 (1) *nihil fidei* (2) ϕ *fidei nihil* (or nil). V 5, 7 (1) *At nos non sinemus* (2) *At id nos* etc. Ad. I 2, 53 (1) *istuc tibi placet* (2) *tibi istuc placet* (3) By² *si tibi ita placet*. II 1, 40 (1) *nam liberali ego illam* (2) 15 A XI *nam ego liberam illam assero causa mariti* (sic) 15 B VIII *nam ego liberali illam assero causam manu* 15 A VIII *nam ego illam assero liberali* etc. II 1, 54 (1) *hanc rationem* DG (2) ϕ *has rationes* (3) By² reads *Set nemo dabit et ego frustra mecum has rationes puto*. IV 1, 6 (1) *nimis misere cupio* (2) 15 B VIII *misere nimis cupio* with Donatus and editors ϕ omit *nimis*. V 4, 23 (1) *experiar* (ϕ) *experiamur*. V 7, 9 (1) *Turbas hymenaeum* (2) 15 B VIII *turbam et hymeneum* 15 A VIII om. *et* 15 A XI om. *turbas*. V 8, 24 (1) *Quid restat* (2) ϕ *quod restat* (3) By² *Quid? numquid restat?* V 9, 26 (1) *pater mi* DG (2) ϕ *mi pater*. Hec. I 2, 43 (1) *senem se esse* (2) 15 A VIII *se esse senem* ϕ *se senem esse*. I 2, 103 (1) *convenibat* (2) ϕ *conveniebat*. II 1, 33 (1) *ego solvi curis vos ceteris* (2) ϕ *ego vos solvi a curis*, except that 15 B VIII omits *a* (3) By² *Quae erant hic curares; cum ego vos solvi curis ceteris*. V 1, 9 (1) *questus mihi obstat* (2) ϕ *mihi questus obstat*. V 2, 7 (1) *exquire*, (*licet* om.) = AD (2) ϕ *exquire licet*. V 4, 21 (1) *unus omnium homo* A (2) 15 A XI and 15 A VIII *unus hominum homo* 15 B VIII *hominum unus homo*. Phorm. II 1, 8 (1) *etiamne id spatium cum rasura* (2) ϕ *etiamne id*. V 9, 39 (1) *faxo cum tali mactatum* (2) ϕ *faxo tali sit mactatus* (3) By² *Faxo tali sit mactatus atque hoc infortunio*.

rape DEG, 908 *civem hinc* DG, 915 *sit vir* DGV, 950 *nêpe* SYM, *Id scilicet* DGV. So far as I know it is the only MS. which offers *circum itione* (adopted by the edd. for *circuitione*) in And. I 2, 31 (202). Bentley however says, "Quin et hic nonnulli codd. *Circumitione*." In v. 111 it has *tam flet* for *tam fert*. In 249 it keeps *si* which DEG omit. Traces of the influence of the PC family are seen in v. 504 *cepi*, 529 *fieri has*, 717 *putavi* and elsewhere, and it must therefore be assigned to the mixed class of Terence MSS. As a rule, its peculiar readings have nothing to commend them, and are due either to gross carelessness in transposition or to glosses, e. g. 197 *quo minus fiant*, 534 *dicebant* for *aiebant* and *natam meam* for *filiam*.

There remain to be considered a few passages where Bentley quotes two Regii. In Eun. II 2, 32 15 A XII has *discipuli* in the text, and 15 A XI *discipli* between the lines the *varia lectio* to which Bentley refers. Bent.^a reads

*Si potis ut tanquam philosophorum disciplinae ex ipsis
Vocabula habent parasiti item Gnathonici vocentur.*

Ad. Prol. 5 *factum id oporteat* is really found only in 15 B VIII as Umpfenbach shows (l. c. p. 462) while in Phorm. III 1, 20 15 A XI and 15 B VIII are referred to. In Phorm. I 3, 24 the reference is to 15 A XI and 15 A XII. In Phorm. III 2, 12 Bentley simply says "Nostri *Te esse duro uno Regio excepto*." No one of the Regii has *esse duro te*, as is shown in note II. In And. I 5, 52 no one of the MSS. exactly agrees with Bentley's statement, but 15 B VIII which has *illi utraeque nunc res inutiles* is probably the one meant, the rest have *illi nunc utraeque res inutiles* DEG. In Hec. V 4, 12 Bentley reports *unus ex Regiis recentior* as having *Egon te qui*, 15 B VIII has *egon qui te*, the rest have no *te*. In Phorm. V 9, 59, 15 A XI has *Tuum nomen dic quod est*, 15 B VIII *nomen tuum* etc., 15 A XII *Tu tuum nomen dic quod est*. None of the present Regii have *tibi* which Umpfenbach adopts from Bentley. For these slight discrepancies I cannot account except by supposing that Bentley was careless.

After having thus by actual examination succeeded in identifying the *codices Regii* used by Bentley, I was able during a very brief stay in Cambridge to consult a book, of whose existence I had not previously known, which every one must admit has a most important bearing upon this question, namely, the very copy of Terence in which Bentley recorded his MS. collations made while preparing his famous edition. This interesting book is

now in the library of Trinity College, and is numbered B 17, 33. Its title is "Publii Terentii Carthaginiensis Afri Comoediae VI His accedunt integrae notae Donati, Eugraphii, Faerni, Boecleri, Farnabii, Mer. Casauboni. Tan. Fabri. cum indice locupletiss. Amstelodami et Lugd. Bat. MDCLXXXVI." A memorandum in Bentley's handwriting reads: "Quaere Donati editionem Romae 1492 quam saepe laudat Rivius." On two separate leaves we find lists of the MSS. used by Bentley. which I here give in full:

- D codex Dunelmensis vetustissimus 4to.
- M cod. Episcopi Mori. 700 annorum 4to.
- P cod. Collegii St. Petri 500 annorum 4to.
- S cod. Dⁿ Shippen.
- C codex Collegii Corporis Christi.
- R codex Regius 500 annorum.
- T alter olim Theyeri 300 annorum.
- Ch alter chartaceus 220 ann.
- B alter 500 annorum.

And again just before the title-page:

- Characteres Librorum Mstorum quibus usi sumus.
- D codex Dunelmensis, nunc in Bibl. Bodleiana Oxonii 900 ann.
- M codex Jo. Mori Episc. Eliensis 800 ann.
- C codex Bibl. Collegii Corporis Xti Cantab. 600.
- P codex Collegii Sti Petri Cantab. 500.
- S codex Dⁿ Shippen. Oxoniensis.
- R codex Regiae Bib. Londini 500.
- T codex Theyeri Bibl. nunc Regiae 400.
- Ch sive chartaceus Regiae Bibl. 300.

It will be seen that these two lists substantially agree. B, however, is omitted from the second, and the Academicus which Bentley designates throughout the book as A is included in neither. In the age assigned to the different MSS. there are some discrepancies. Thus in the first list T = 300 ann., in the second 400 (*i. e.* 15th or 14th century), Ch = 220 ann. in the first list, a curiously precise date, in the second 300 ann. D which is called *vetustissimus* is credited in the second list with 900 ann., which makes it older than the Parisinus. But Bentley was probably inclined to overestimate the age of his more important MSS. Thus he assigns M to the 10th or 11th century, and still further proof that his own estimate varied is furnished us by And. IV 2, 29 where in his commentary Bentley says, "Duo ex nostris

vetustissimi *ad me venias*," i. e. omitting *ut*. Now in Fabri's text I find *ut* underscored and on the margin \S DM. In And. V 4, 25 I find *tibi* (sic) and on the margin \S CB with the following note "*tibi* in M post rasuram. Puto fuisse PAM ut Pamphilus nomen haesitanti suggesserit." Compare this with Bentley's commentary "Ejecimus *Tibi* quod abest a Regio et C. C. C. et in altero 900 annorum a manu secunda et post rasuram ut jure quis suspicetur PAM fuisse erasum et interpolatum *Tibi*." Here then the age 900 ann. is assigned to M, which would make it of about the same antiquity as the Dunelmensis. Clearly we must allow Bentley a range of two or three centuries in fixing the age of a MS., and as very good judges often disagree to the same extent, we need not be surprised. The Regius quoted in And. V 4, 25 we have seen above (Note I) to be 15 A VIII, which must, therefore, be identified with B, although the British Museum Catalogue assigns it to saec XI. Whether M can be identified with any existing MS. I am unable to state, but I think it quite probable, as within a few years the Dunelmensis has been brought to light. Of this latter Robinson Ellis (Academy, Dec. 1, 1872, p. 459) says, "Both Kraus and Brix agree in supposing this codex to be identical with that called by Bentley *veterrimus*; it would be interesting to prove whether his conjecture is well founded; but the MS. has not been forthcoming for the last 150 years, and is perhaps no longer discoverable. Leng calls this much the finest of all his MSS., and any one who would bring the lost treasury to light would confer a service which would be appreciated by every student of Latin philology."¹

The identity of the Dunelmensis with the *veterrimus*, if it were not fully established by Bentley's own statement, might be settled

¹At the time when this was written the Dunelmensis was snugly hidden away among the treasures of the Bodleian. The credit of rediscovering it is due solely to Mr. T. W. Jackson, fellow of Worcester College, Oxford, from whom we may shortly expect some interesting details concerning it. Its present catalogue number is F 2, 13 (Bodleian). I have collated it for the Andria, but I do not wish to anticipate Mr. Jackson's article by giving to print any of its readings.

Ellis shows that Ff, 6, 4 in the University Library of Cambridge did actually belong to John Moore, Bishop of Norwich, but that it cannot be Bentley's 900 year codex. It cannot therefore be M, as in And. V 4, 25 it has *tibi* not over erasure. Is it not Leng's Nb? It follows from what I have said that Umpfenbach (l. d. p. 466) is wrong in considering the cod. 900 ann. and the Academicus to be the same.

by a reference to And. II 3, 21 where Bentley says "*speres* Ita ex nostris veterrimus." The Trinity Terence has on the margin D *speres*. So at And. V 6, 7 the marginal *quin iam* DC explains Bentley's 'Duo ex nostris veterrimi,' and proves also that he reckoned C among the oldest of his MSS. The age assigned (600 ann.) agrees with Robinson Ellis' statement that it belongs to the 11th century.—And. II 2, 6 I find *aut* underscored and on the margin 9 DCSHChRB.—cf. Bentley's comm. "sex ex nostris meliores non agnoscunt illud *aut*."

Of these 'better' MSS. Sh is the Shippenianus discussed by Umpfenbach (l. c. p. 473) now in the library of Brasenose College, Oxford, as already pointed out by Ellis in the aforesaid article. Ch. the *chartaceus* is of course Reg. 15 A XI. R is Regius 15 A XII, the Regius par excellence, and as such, most frequently cited by Bentley. For proof compare the statement in note IV regarding And. II 1, 20 with the marginal note *ad auxiliandum* PR. B is Reg. 15 A VIII. Concerning the Corpus Christi and Peterhouse MSS. (C & P), I can add nothing new to Umpfenbach's statements (ib. pp. 470 f.) T is shown to be 15 B VIII by the marginal note to And. II 2, 15, *fo. (= fortasse) libero tibi uxorem non dat iam C / sic T*. Compare Bentley's ed. and the statement in note II. Bentley's Academicus has not to my knowledge been identified with any English MS. I have not been able myself to collect the necessary data, nor to carry the investigation as far as I could wish, but it would be very easy for an English scholar resident in Cambridge to pick out from the mass of Bentley's MS. collations the readings peculiar to the Academicus and to M, which would enable us to form a very fair idea of these MSS. even if they should never be found. In any future reprint of Bentley's edition I think the editor might do a service to Latin philology by placing in brackets an exact specification of the MSS. cited by Bentley, using his notation. I close this article with some specimens based upon my own very incomplete notes. And. Prol. 11, tres ex nostris recentiores (APT) *sunt dissimili*. I 1, 89 Recte tres ex nostris (ChAB) *quid id est?* I 2, 27 unus tantum (A) *ostendere*. I 2, 34 recte tres meliores (PDSH) *dices*. II 1, 37 Unus (A) *est*. II 2, 19 a duobus nostris abest *ibi* (PT). II 4, 5 duo e nostris (ChD) *qua* = Par. II 6, 20 Duo ex nostris primarii (DC) *Est obsonatum* Recte. III 1, 1, Duo tantum ex nostris (ChT) *dixisti* quae vera lectio est. III 2, 3 cum veterimo nostro (D) *Fac ista ut*. III 4, 10 duo (TA) *Nunquam ego*

istuc quivi alter (R) *Nunquam istuc ego quivi*. III 5, 9 *Me pro iam* duo ex nostris veterrimi (DC). IV 1, 41 ex nostris antiquiores omnes (DCPMT) *Factum est hoc*. IV 3, 2 quinque ex nostris (DPTBA) *putabam* Recte *putavi* (RCh). IV 5, 22 duo ex nostris (DS) *O optume* = Victorianus. V 1, 17 *Facta* (Ch) et a prima manu duo alii (MB). V 3, 24 Tres ex vetustioribus (CDM) *At tandem*. V 4, 38 Noster veterrimus (D) *odium*. V 6, 15 Meliores et plures libri *propere adcerse* (DSBARTMP.)

MINTON WARREN.

VI.—“FOR —— SAKE.”

Having had occasion recently to examine the N. T. usage of the expressions *for my sake, for Jesus' sake, for Christ's sake, &c.*, especially with a view to their historical origin and the force of the word *sake*, I determined to push the investigation further, and search for examples of this use in Early English, which I have thrown together below as a contribution to the history of the expressions. It was very soon ascertained that the locution did not occur in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, nor in Wycliffe's New Testament, judging by a careful examination of all the references given by Cruden, but first came in with Tyndale, and then as a translation usually of *ἐνεκα* or *διὰ*, though in 2 Cor. xii. 10, 3 John iii. 7, of *ὑπέρ*, and in Eph. iv. 32 of *ἐν*,—but here Coverdale has *in Christ*, following Wycliffe, and the Revised Version adopts it also.

A very few examples of this usage will suffice. They are taken from Bosworth and Waring's Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Wycliffe and Tyndale Gospels, 2d ed., 1874, Skeat's reprint of Forshall and Madden's Wycliffe and Purvey's New Testament, 1879, and Dabney's reprint from Bagster's edition of Tyndale's New Testament, 1837.

Matt. xiv. 3. A. S.—And sette on cwertern *for* ðam wife Herodiaden Philippes hys brōðer ;

W.—And putte [puttide] him in to prisoun *for* Erodias, the wif of his brother ;

T.—And put hym in preson *ffor* Herodias *sake*, hys brother Phips wife.

John xii. 9. A. S.—And hig cōmon, naes nā *for* ðaes Hælendes þingon synderlice ;

W.—And thei camen, not oonly *for* Jhesu ;

T.—And they cam, nott *for* Jesus *sake* only.

1 Cor. iv. 10. W.—We foolis *for* Crist ; T.—We are foles *for* Christes *sake*. 2 Cor. iv. 5. W.—And vs ȝoure seruantis *bi* Jhesu ; T.—Oure selves youre servauntes *for* Jesus *sake*. Phil. i. 29. W.—But also that ȝe suffren *for* him ; T.—But also suffre *for* his *sake*.

These examples might easily be multiplied, but the above are sufficient to show the N. T. usage.

The A. S. *sacu* is defined by Grein *contentio, hostilitas, lis, rixa, pugna*, and Bosworth has also "A cause or suit in law, process, accusation." Stratmann (Dictionary of Old English, XII-XV Centuries) defines *sake, lis, rixa, causa, injuria*, and amongst other references we have *withouten sake*—"sine causa," Psalms iii. 8, the earliest reference for the modern usage being *for hire sake*: Ancren Riwe, p. 4 (Morton's ed.)

In transmitting to Dr. J. A. H. Murray, editor of the Philological Society's Dictionary, slips of the second volume of Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, I inquired if he could give me the earliest references for the expression, *for —'s sake*. I append his reply, and am indebted to his kindness for the first four quotations given below. He says: "*For —'s sake* I am not able to carry back beyond the Ancren Riwe, though it occurs in several works of that age. But this sense of *sake* does not once occur in Ormin nor in Layamon, both about 1200; it does *not* occur in the Hatton Gospels, c. 1160 (which I have examined with the concordance), and I have no record of it from the Lambeth or Trinity Homilies of 1175-1200. We may, therefore, say that it appears in the first third of the thirteenth century, I presume first in a transferred use of the legal sense of *sacu*, to speak for one's *cause* or *behalf*. I enclose some of the earliest quotations we have for *sake*."

Thus it appears that the meaning *pugna, lis, rixa*, the common A. S. sense, which we find in Layamon and Orm, passes to *causa*, and thence to the modern meaning *for my cause* or *behalf, on my account*, most probably as Dr. Murray suggests. The four quotations enclosed by Dr. Murray are as follows:

(1) "Ancren Riwe, p. 4, c. 1220-30. South Western. Dorsetshire. Me aski 3e hwat riwe 3e ancren schullen holden? 3e schullen alle-weis, mid alle mihte, and mid alle strence wel witen 3e inre [riwe], and 3e uttre *vor hire sake*."

(2) St. Katherine (Abbotsford Club), p. 6, l. 98, c. 1220. West Midland, c. Herefordshire (considered by some to be by same author as A. R.)

Dus lo *for hure sake*
Ane dale hu atheld
Of hire eldrene god
And spende al that other
In nedfule and in nakede.

(3) Genesis and Exodus (E. E. T. Soc.), l. 3731, c. 1250. East Midland, Suffolk.

Oc for is benes and *for is sake[n]*
Yet he sal wið hem milche maken.

Editor supplies [n]. One might also suggest *sake* : *make*.

- (4) Wright's Lyric Poetry, VI. 28, c. 1300.

Levedi, al *for thine sake*
longinge is y-lent me on."

To these I add the following from the literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, with occasional comments :

- (5) Owl and Nightingale (Stratmann's ed.), c. 1225.

1160. Oper þu bodest cheste and *sake*.

1430. And mai eft habbe to make

Hire leofmon wiþute *sake*.

Here *sake* still preserves its original sense.

- (6) Creed. (Maetzner's A. E. Sprachproben, p. 50, 8). 1st half 13th cent.

On rode nailedd *for mannes sake*.

- (7) Hymn to the Virgin. Maetzner, p. 54, 39. 1st half 13th cent.

That ich nevere *for feondes sake*
furgo thiþ eche liht.

- (8) p. 55, 47. Lavedi, *for thine sake*

- (9) p. 55, 69. Thu do that ich *for hire sake*

beo i-maked so clene.

Here add two other Hymns to the Virgin. The first is printed by Mr. Furnivall in Academy, No. 503, Dec. 24, 1881, entitled by him The Hymn of Chaucer's Oxford Clerk, "Angelus ad Virginem," from Arundel MS. 284, leaf 154, lines 58-60, c. 1250-60.

- (10) hus giue *for þine sake*
him so her for to seruen
þat þe [=he] us to him take.

The second is found in the Appendix to Old English Homilies, 2d series (E. E. T. Soc., ed. Morris), p. 257, l. 58.

- (11) þo godes sune aliȝte wolde
On eorþe al *for ure sake*.

This Hymn belongs to the *thirteenth* century.

Genesis and Exodus (E. E. T. S., ed. Morris), c. 1250.

- (12) p. 16, 551. *For swilc sinful dedes sake*

So cam on werlde wreche and wrake.

- (13) p. 40, 1392. Askede here if ȝhe migte taken

Herberge *for hire frendes sake*[n].

- (14) p. 80, 2806. And wurð sone an uglike snake

And Moyses fleg *for dredes sake*.

The Fox and the Wolf (Maetzner, p. 133, 40-44), c. 1275.

- (15) I have leten thine hennen blod

That I do *for almes sake*.

- (16) King Horn (E. E. T. S., ed. Lumby), 1453-4. 2d half 13th cent.

pis tur he let make

Al for pine sake.

Legend of St. Gregory (Zupitza's A. E. Uebungsbuch, p. 53). Before 1300. XX, 37-8.

- (17) pabot bad þe fischers boþe ten mark & the cradel take
& bad þai schuld nouȝt be wroþ for þat litel childes sake.

Sir Tristrem (Maetzner, p. 238). End of 13th cent. 81st stanza, 1-4.

- (18) To prisoun thai gun take
Erl, baroun, and knight,
For Douke Morgan sake,
Many on dyd down right.

Here we have a proper name without inflection used with *sake*.

Cursor Mundi (E. E. T. S., ed. Morris), 6833, c. 1320.

- (19) Sle þou nan wiþ-outen sake (vv. ll.).

Cursor Mundi in Morris's Specimens of Early English:

- (20) p. 132, 181-2. For he moght find nan wit sak[e]
On the sakles he suld ta wrake.

- (21) p. 137, 325-6. Mak us a welle, for mine sake,
þat alle mai plenté o water take.

These examples from the Cursor Mundi are interesting, as showing the three meanings of *sake*, and the second containing also *sakles*=innocent, as in the Ormulum and Ancren Riwe.

Stabat Mater (Wulcker's A. E. Lesebuch I, p. 47), 31-33. No date, but as it follows Hampole, c. 1350.

- (22) Moder, now y shal the telle,
ȝef y ne deȝe, thou gost to helle,
Y thole ded for thine sake.

St. Andrew. Alt-Englische Legenden, ed. Horstmann, c. 1350.

- (23) p. 5, 75-7. And unto my goddes offrand make
Or els I sall for þi god sake
Ger hang þe right on swilk a tre.

- (24) 103-4. I wold be wurthi for his sake
Opon a cross my dede to take.

St. Laurentius. Barbour's Legenden-Sammlung, ed. Horstmann, I, p. 191, c. 1350-1400.

- (25) Quhare-of mene wont war to mak
In old tyme cronis for þe sak
Of victory þat gudmene wane.

Interesting as the first example I have met with of *for the sake of*.

The Lay-Folks' Mass-Book (E. E. T. S., ed. Simmons), Text B. 453-7 (Royal MS. 17 B XVII), c. 1375.

- (26) Make þi prayeres in þat stede
 for alle þi frendes þat are dede,
 And *for* alle cristen *soules sake*
 swilk prayere shal þou make.

The examples of the use of *sake* in Gower are not numerous, only four in the last half of the second volume; but in Chaucer they are much more frequent. It is strange that the expression should not be found in the New Testament of Wycliffe, when both of his contemporaries make use of it.

A couple of examples apiece from Chaucer and Gower must suffice:

Chaucer's Clerkes Tale. (Skeat's C. P. ed.)

(27) 135. And tak a wyf, *for* hye *goddess sake*.

(28) 560. For this nyght shaltow deyen *for my sake*; also lines 7, 255, and 975.

Gower's Confessio Amantis (ed. Pauli), II.

(29) p. 217. For lucre and nought *for loves sake*.

(30) p. 229. And for Thetis *his moder sake*.

Other examples may be found on pp. 226, 314.

An examination of Morris's Old English Homilies, 2d series, which belong to the *twelfth* century, shows us that the expression *for God's love* was then used where *for God's sake* was more common later. An example of this is found on p. 83, l. 21, 22: "Hie giuen here elmesse noht *for godes luue* ac *for* neheboreden oðer *for* kinraden," translated by the editor, "they give their alms not for God's sake, but for the sake of their neighbors or kinsmen." See also p. 157, l. 24, and p. 159, l. 10. This expression continued in use, as is seen in Lives of Saints: Thomas Beket (Maetzner, p. 177), c. 1300. 1807. A sire! he seide, *for Godes love*, ne passe noȝt ȝut the see. Also lines 1975, 2094, and in 2273, And bad him, *for the love of God*, in such angusse him rede.

A hundred years later Chaucer would probably have used *for Goddess sake*.

These examples show the use of *sake* with the possessive adjectives and genitive during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, while the language was forming, and from the rareness with which the form *for the sake of* is met with, this expression was evidently of later origin, and possibly originated in the North. It deserves notice that this form is not found in the Authorized Version, as quoted by Cruden, but the Revisers have occasionally made use of it.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

RECENT WORK IN OLD NORSE.

With the continually growing interest in the comparatively new study of *Germanistik*, Old Norse like every other Germanic dialect has received in the last decade increased attention, and Old Norse philology has made most gratifying advance in lexicography, grammar and text criticism. Outside of Scandinavia, where one might expect the study of the old language would be cultivated, for patriotic reasons, if for no other, lectures on O. N. grammar and literature are delivered at all the German universities, certainly every second or third semester, and no Germanist goes out into the world without the knowledge of at least its Laut- and Flexionslehre. German interest, too, is also unmistakably manifested by the almost constant appearance both of texts and translations, as well as by the great mass of grammatical and text criticism printed in the various journals. Both France and Holland have O. N. scholars who have made valuable contributions to O. N. philological literature, and that an active interest is felt in England is evinced by the publication of such works as the Oxford Icel.-Engl. Dictionary and the Sturlunga Saga.

O. N. lexicography has been done almost exclusively by Icelanders. In 1860 appeared (Copenhagen) what must always remain the classical dictionary of the language of the Eddas and the poems of the Scalds—the *Lexicon poeticum antiquae ling. Sept.* by Sveinbjörn Egilsson, rector of the gymnasium at Reykjavik; it is a work of unquestioned scholarship and ability, with copious citations and (Latin) equivalents, but in the light of better texts, needs, even at this early date, numerous revisions. In 1863 was published (Copenhagen) the *Oldnordisk Ordbog* (O. N.-Danish), by Erik Jonsson, another Iclander; its usefulness is, however, much impaired by the entire absence of citations. In 1867 appeared (Christiania) the excellent *Ordbog over det gamle norske Sprog* (O. N.-Danish) by Joh. Fritzner, a Norwegian, who now promises a new edition; and finally in 1874 (Oxford) the great *Icelandic-English Dictionary*, begun by Richard Cleasby and completed by an Iclander resident in England, Gudbrand Vigfusson, whose work it mainly is. What the *Lex. poet.* is to the poetical literature the Icel.-Engl. Dict. is to the phenomenal wealth of O. N. prose writing, but it is unfortunately characterized by hurried and superficial labor, a matter to be the more deplored in so ambitious a work. No one perhaps was better fitted to write an O. N. dictionary than Vigfusson, both because of his remarkable familiarity with the whole of the old literature and from having Icelandic for his mother-tongue; these facts have, however, told against the correctness of his work, as he oftentimes trusts for a citation to a treach-

erous memory where another would have referred directly to the text. Opening the book quite at random one finds, for instance, p. 544 SKELPUNNR, *adj. shell-thin, Eg. in a verse*; SKEPTI, n. II. *a handle, Grett. in a verse*. As the Grettis Saga contains 476 verses, and the Egils Saga, without counting the poems, 470, the utility of the references is scarcely apparent. On the opposite page, again, SKERPLA is cited *Edda* 103, but upon consulting the Edda one is surprised not to be able to find it in the whole work. The etymologies, too, are often extremely venturesome and misleading, and in numberless cases absolutely worthless. With all its faults the Icel.-Engl. Dict. is the most valuable, both in completeness of vocabulary and fulness of definition, of all O. N. lexica, and for the mere reading of texts is wholly satisfactory. Dr. Jon Thorkelsson, the present rector of the gymnasium at Reykjavik, is engaged in compiling a second *Supplement til islandske Ordbøger* (the first was completed in 1876), which appears in instalments in the yearly programme of the gymnasium, within whose pages he has already printed much critical work of the highest value.

Of O. N. grammarians, Prof. Ludvig Wimmer, of Copenhagen, is unquestionably at the head, and to him more than to anybody else is due the fact that O. N. grammar stands upon a footing of equal progress with the best dialect work in Germany; his *Oldnordisk formålære* appeared (Copenhagen) in 1870, and was translated 1871 into German by Sievers, the well-known Germanist; a revised Swedish edition appeared at Lund in 1874, which is by far the best of all O. N. grammars. Wimmer is also the author of the most important work of late years on runes; his book *Runeskriftens oprindelse og udvikling i Norden* (Copenhagen, 1874) takes up the disputed question of the origin of the elder rune alphabet, which he proves in a most incontrovertible manner to have been derived from the Latin. Vigfusson published *Outlines of Grammar* in the introduction to his dictionary, and appended to his *Icelandic Prose Reader* (Oxford, 1879) is *A Short Grammar*. The last-named work is an exceedingly well made text-book, containing numerous extracts from the prose literature, with explanatory notes, grammar and glossary.

Icelandic phonetics is treated in another book printed at Oxford—Henry Sweet's *Handbook of Phonetics*, in which a chapter is devoted to Old and Modern Icelandic. The author's headings are, however, misleading, as, while his entire scheme for the modern language is wellnigh absolutely faultless, he gives to Old Icelandic exactly the same phonetic value, which it by no means had. Thus in the extract on p. 148 from the Snorra Edda, *d* is represented by *au* and *æ* by *ai*, values which they certainly have at present, but which are comparatively new. So almost the entire vowel system might be cited; indeed, the change in pronunciation is the one great change that the Icelandic language has undergone. If the author, on the other hand, merely meant to show the adaptability of the new pronunciation to the old language, he should certainly have left out the extracts from the old poetry, which, with the rest, he gives in normalized orthography!

The last decade has been particularly marked by the appearance of texts, some of which see the light for the first time; a majority, however, are criti-

cal and often diplomatic editions of texts previously published. Several societies are actively engaged with O. N. literature and philological studies. The Icelandic Literary Society, founded in 1816, still continues its activity and publishes each year its quota of literature. The last few years have witnessed the completion of the *Diplomatarium Islandicum*, a most important work for the comparative study of Icelandic, *Safn til Sögu Islands*, and the *Biskupa Sögur*. The Danish "Nordiske Oldskrift-Selskab," founded in 1825, has published (1875) what may justly be termed the *editio princeps* of the *Njáls Saga*, the greatest of all Icelandic sagas, in a critical text with variants edited by Prof. Konrad Gislason; in 1878 appeared the *Saga of Tristram ok Isönd*. The Danish "Nordiske litteratur-samfund," which discontinued its publications in 1870, after a quarter-century of literary life, again awoke in 1880 to increased activity under the title of "Samfundet til udgivelse af gammel nordisk litteratur," and have already issued six texts. The Swedish "Fornskrift Sällskapet" has also recently published a number of valuable texts edited by Cederschiöld, Wisén and others. The trustees of the Arna Magnusson bequest in Copenhagen continue at rather long intervals their text publications. In 1869 appeared the MSS. of *Valdemar's Laws* in Old Danish and *Elucidarius* in Icelandic, followed in 1877 by the *Codex Runicus* in photolithographic fac-simile; in 1879 was published a new edition of the code of laws called the *Grágás*, and in 1880 appeared the first part of the long looked for third volume of the *Snorra Edda*. The latter work has been published beside in two other editions, viz. those of Thorleifr Jonsson (Copenhagen, 1875) and Ernst Wilken (Paderborn, 1877); neither of them is, however, an improvement on the edition published in Reykjavik in 1848 by Sv. Egilsson. The *Sæmundar Edda* has also appeared in two editions, viz. a second, revised, edition by Svend Grundtvig (Copenhagen, 1868), and a new edition by Karl Hildebrand (Paderborn, 1876); but by far the best edition is still the one published by Bugge, Christiania, 1867. Aside from complete editions, extracts from both Eddas have been published in various reading-books and text collections; Prof. Möbius, of Kiel, the Nestor of O. N. scholarship in Germany, has also published a critical edition of the *Háttatal* in two parts. Aside from the publications of societies, a large number of Saga texts has also appeared independently. In Norway, Carl Unger has been particularly productive, and has printed an astonishing number of MSS., many of them for the first time. In Germany, Möbius, Maurer, Vigfusson, Kölbing and others have edited numerous texts.

In the history of O. N. literature the best monograph that has appeared of late years, in any language, is the *Prolegomena* to the Oxford edition of the *Sturlunga Saga* by Vigfusson. The author brings to his task the extraordinary knowledge of the ancient literature, both printed and manuscript, which he alone of all others possesses, and this, joined with remarkable critical acuteness and clearness of thought and statement, make the *Prolegomena*, though but a résumé, a veritable mine of information in which all subsequent historians must dig. The most important critical part of the whole is the chapter on "the Eddic Poems," in which the author endeavors

to prove the contested point of the origin of the miscellaneous poems composing the collection now called the Edda. The statement is made (p. clxxxvi) that "these poems, with one or two exceptions, owe their origin to Norse poets in the 'Western Iceland,' (i. e. Orkney, Shetland), that "they date from a time subsequent to the settlement of Iceland from those islands." The premises as regards the first part are, however, not proved, and a darkness veils their place of origin that will probably never be dispelled; the view as to their time of origin, on the other hand, rests upon a better foundation, and is shared by Bugge and others. A more ambitious work than the Prolegomena is Horn's *Geschichte der Lit. des Skand. Nordens* (Leipzig, 1880), but it is full of inaccuracies and half-statements, at least in the O. N.-Icelandic part, which make its scientific value absolutely null.

In literary criticism nothing has lately been written to rival in interest and importance a work promised so long ago as 1879, but of which the first part only has thus far appeared,—*Studier over de nordiske Gude- og Heltesagns Oprindelse*, by Sophus Bugge of Christiania, the foremost Norwegian scholar in O. N. The aim of Bugge's work is to substantiate the somewhat startling statement: "Of numerous northern legends of gods and heroes, one may assert that they reproduce, or at least originated under the influence of, narratives, poems or legends, religious or superstitious ideas, which half heathen or heathen Northmen during the time of the Vikings received upon the British Islands from Christians, i. e. either from monks or from people who were educated under monkish influences." That this is a conclusion entirely at variance with the received opinion of Norse mythology contained in the Eddas and hero-songs need scarcely be said. The old theory looked upon these stories of the gods and heroes *in toto* as sacred remnants of the primitive culture of the whole Germanic race; the new one, while it does not deny the Germanic foundation, sees the superstructure almost entirely built up of antique-classic, i. e. Greek-Roman and Jewish-Christian materials. The whole matter is stated by the author with such acuteness and force as almost to carry conviction with it; but it is not a matter either to accept or discard with a breath, and the whole work must first appear before a logical and consistent criticism can be passed. A monograph of similar import, but confined to one Eddic poem, is *Völuspá og de Sybillinske Orakler* by A. Chr. Bang (Christiania, 1879), in which the author refers the origin of the *Völuspá* to an imitation of the Sibylline oracles.¹ One thing is certain in the light of modern criticism, that the Eddic poems are not entitled to the high antiquity previously ascribed to them. "Odin, himself," said Resen in 1665, "was the author of *Hávamál*," while Schimmelmänn, in his translation of the *Snorra Edda* in 1777, declares that "Edda is the pure word of God and the oldest book in the world."

W. H. CARPENTER.

¹ See American Journal of Philology, vol. 1, p. 440.

DEMOSTHENES. Translated from the French of L. BRÉDIF by M. J. MAC-MAHON. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co., 1881.

This monograph, containing twelve chapters, constituted originally a course of lectures delivered, we infer, at the Lycée of Toulouse.

M. Brédif, like a patriotic Frenchman, draws lessons from the political condition of Greece in the time of Demosthenes for the admonition of his countrymen, and writes from a spirit of genuine sympathy with the present order of things in France. In his introduction the author traces the development of Greek oratory, and takes occasion to discuss the relation of morals to eloquence. While it is true that "bad taste and good morals are sometimes found together," Brédif has not made out his case that eloquence owes something to the decline of morals, and that Cato's definition "*vir bonus dicendi peritus*" is untrue. The chapters in which Demosthenes is described as the citizen and the statesman form the most valuable part of the work.

Although the colors are somewhat glowing and confused, the portraiture of Demosthenes is, in the main, accurate and lifelike. Still, no scholar can read this book without a painful sense of the lack of sober and critical learning. This is apparent, first, in the author's indiscriminating use of the anecdotes narrated by Plutarch, Pseudo-Plutarch, and the grammarians. Of Isocrates, for example, he repeats the story, as though he believed it, that Nicocles paid him twenty talents for one discourse. Brédif might have gone ten talents higher if his aim was to tell the biggest possible story, by referring to the case of Evagoras.

Disregard of scholarship is again apparent in the author's unquestioning citations from the "fourth" Philippic, as if there had never been a doubt of its authenticity. Can it be that M. Brédif is unacquainted with the studies of Dobree, Westermann, and Schaefer, not to speak of the suspicions entertained by the ancient rhetoricians? The most unsatisfactory part of the book is that which treats of the oratory of Demosthenes. In the chapters devoted to this topic we look in vain for anything like an analysis of the literary style of Demosthenes. Nothing is said about the structure of periods, selection of words, paucity of figures of speech, abundance of figures of thought, in a word, about the verbal and formal peculiarities of the composition of the orator. Where Brédif speaks of the plans of the orations of Demosthenes and the insertion of the documents, we notice again his ignorance of the critical studies of recent date. Otherwise he would hardly cite the oration against Timocrates as a fair instance of inconsistency in the structure of the plans of D.'s orations.

Brédif strangely misunderstands the relation of Aeschines and Demosthenes as accuser and accused when he says, p. 354: "Demosthenes reproached Aeschines for having entered against him the suit of Ctesiphon a long time after the events, although previous to that time 'he had never accused him, never prosecuted him.' Aeschines returned a direct contradiction, and recalled different circumstances in which he had not only accused Demosthenes, but had clearly convicted him (*φανερῶς ἐξηλέγχον*) of sacrilege, corruption and theft. Whom are we to believe? One of the

two is certainly an unpardonable falsifier." In this passage there is evidently confusion of a formal accusation or suit at law with a charge uttered in a speech against an opponent.

It is doubtful if the service rendered to the English student of Demosthenes by the translation of this work is sufficient to compensate for the labor. But M. Brédif deserved a better fate than to fall into the hands of such a translator as Mr. MacMahon; indeed, a worse fate could hardly be imagined. To say with Addison (in changed terms), "I have been *traduced* in English," is putting it mildly. The reader's first suspicion of the purity of the English is aroused by the following remarkable statement in the translator's preface: "That the work is free from errors and worthy of the admirable original, we can by no means vouchsafe." To vouch for anything whatever is extremely hazardous for a translator who says "priority" for superiority, "apology" for apologue, "obligation" for requirement, "false lights" for false windows, who can say "Philip sometimes founders," and is willing that his readers should understand, if they can, such statements as these: (p. 119), "But war costs dearly. It will cost more to recede before the expenses it requires"; (p. 191), "The first two, proofs of the acknowledgment of the people whom Athens had saved, were too honorable to the minister of Athens to frustrate his apology"; (p. 207), "Without speaking of the uniform developments which the uniformity of situations produced, the orators of the Pnyx or the logographers sometimes willingly bound themselves to socomes¹ [*des banalités*] which were not necessary, but decorous."

If by this time the suspicion dawns upon the reader that the translator knows possibly even less of French than of English, a moment's comparison with the original will fairly astound him. Mr. MacMahon translates " . . . aucun des Grecs ni en deçà ni au delà des Thermopyles n'aurait été atteint des maux presents " by "No Greek on this or the other side of Thermopylae could have been reached even with presents." "Démosthène, voluptueux au front sévère, semblait ne se déridier jamais," is rendered "Demosthenes seemed never to unbend his stern and imposing brow." Out of "Il importe de marquer avec netteté dans quel sens et dans quelle mesure Démosthène aime les développements généraux" our translator makes "It is unnecessary to mark clearly in what sense and in what measure Demosthenes favored general developments." But Mr. MacMahon challenges comparison even with the famous "New Guide of the conversation in Portuguese and English" by the following passage in the chapter on "Oratorical Contests": "Among the most desirable virtues the Greeks place the virtue of *antagonism* [*la vertu agonistique*], a composition of stature, velocity and strength Antagonistic virtue even delighted the tribunals" (!) If there is anything beyond that for Boeotian *ἀναισθησία* it is furnished by the translator himself on p. 102: "Bdelycleon, an advocate of Labes, excuses a

¹ As 'socomes' is not every-day English, it may be as well to say that 'socome' is "a custom of tenants to grind corn at their lord's mill." Mr. MacMahon evidently got it out of Spiers and Surene's Dictionary, where it stands as an equivalent of the feudal *banalité*. The figure which Mr. MacMahon has thus imported into Brédif is somewhat startling. Whatever *banalité* there may be in the original, there is assuredly none in the translation.—B. L. G.

thievish dog in these terms: He is a poor ignorant brute. [*Pardonne, il ne sait pas jouer de la lyre*]. Pardon me [says Mr. M.], he cannot play on the lyre. The remark is comic and profound." The translation, if not profound, is at least comic. Mr. M. tells us in his preface that he was induced to undertake his task by the noble incentive of a "love for the Greek language and literature." Who can doubt the genuineness of this motive after reading this passage? "Thus bold pleaders, in order to impose upon the tribunals of judges and readers, often to yield the floor to their adversary. 'Let him speak of my *water-drinking*. I consent to it.'" A love for Greek that can extract proof of the sobriety of Demosthenes from *δειξάτω ἐν τῷ ἐμφυδατὶ* (de Cor. § 139), borders upon the sublime.

M. L. D'OOGÉ.

Zakonishe Grammatik von Dr. MICH. DEFFNER. Erste Hälfte [Phonology]. Berlin: Weidman, 1881. Pp. 176.

Villoison in a note to his Prolegomena to the Iliad referred to the investigation which he had made into this most noteworthy of all modern Greek dialects, and said that he had prepared a grammar and dictionary of it. These were never published, and it is uncertain whether they are among the author's papers in the National Library at Paris: It would be interesting to have them, and thus be able to check the changes which have taken place in the language during the present century.

The first published systematic treatment of the dialect was by Thiersch, in a paper read before the Bavarian Academy of Sciences, in November, 1832, and published in 1835. His opportunities for studying the language had been comparatively meagre. His only visit to Tsaconia (see his Life, II 177, 271) seems to have been on a ten days' trip from Nauplia through Peloponnesus. This trip was made with a political errand, and when he was greatly disturbed by the political uncertainty occasioned by the lack of directions from the Bavarian government after the election of the new king, Otho. His work called the attention of scholars to the peculiarities of the language, but in itself was defective. He had no predecessors whose work might be suggestive even in their mistakes, and had no opportunity to verify the correctness of his information. He hardly touched upon phonology, and considered forms and words which are found elsewhere in Greece to be Tsaconian peculiarities.

In 1846, Oeconomus, a Tsaconian priest, published a grammar of the language with a specimen of the dialect and a dialogue in 360 verses, with a vocabulary. This, as might be expected, is more valuable in its vocabulary than in its treatment of the sounds and forms. Of this book a second edition has been published.

In 1866, Deville, a student of the French School at Athens, published a thesis on the Tsaconian dialect in three parts. The first gives a vocabulary of 374 words with a discussion of their etymology. The second part is devoted to phonology, and the third to inflection. An Appendix gives four pages of specimens of the language. He calls the work of his predecessors

"indefinite, incomplete, and self-contradictory." Deville's work was reviewed by Kind in the *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen* for 1868, and by Comparetti in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, Vol. XVIII. It is to be regretted that Comparetti's article was not accessible to Deffner, although they agree in correcting some of Deville's errors. Comparetti makes an interesting suggestion with regard to the palatal-sibilant *ʃh* sound, which is so common in the Tsaconian dialect. He thinks it quite possible that it may have existed in some of the dialects of ancient Greece. He is not satisfied with Christ's disposal of the Pindaric fragment on *San*.

Based upon the works previously mentioned is the treatise of Moriz Schmidt in Curtius's *Studien*, Vol. III, which was characterized by Professor Sophocles as a *ματαιοπονία*. It rested on a weak foundation.

Dr. Deffner approaches the work far better equipped than any of his predecessors. For thirteen years he has given himself heartily to the study of the modern Greek language, after a thorough course of linguistic training in Germany, under Curtius and Christ. He was thrown much with modern Greek *commilitones* in the Universities of Munich and Leipzig, and the dissertation with which he took his degree at Leipzig in 1871 was on the sounds of the modern Greek language. It was published (*Neograeca*) in Curtius's *Studien*, Vol. IV. For more than ten years he has been connected with the University of Athens. In 1874, assisted by a grant from the Berlin Academy of Sciences, he visited Peloponnesus to study the dialects, and made the important discovery that the oft-repeated statement concerning the number and variety of the dialects of Peloponnesus is false. He found no dialect distinguished from the universally spoken language but this Tsaconian. Concerning this he made two reports to the Berlin Academy which appeared in their *Bericht* for 1875, and which for the most part have been incorporated into this grammar. To Deffner's work on this dialect in his *Archiv* this Journal has already referred (Vol. II, No. 7, pp. 366-7).

Not only has Deffner had the immense advantage of a scientific and idiomatic knowledge of the Greek language, modern and ancient, and acquaintance with the best linguistic methods, but he has enjoyed the benefit of the previous works on this dialect, which gave him suggestions and supplied him with material which he could verify or correct during his visit of four months to the district. This will undoubtedly bear good fruit in the latter part of the grammar. At present, we have only the phonology to compare with the other works on the subject.

It must be recognized as an advance that he has adopted a linguistic or phonetic alphabet. The language has thirty simple consonant sounds, being surpassed in the number of native consonant sounds in actual use only by the Hindustani and Sanscrit. To avoid a barbarous appearance, Deville, as well as Thiersch, contented himself with the Greek alphabet. The sixteen consonant-signs were overworked, and this inexactness was the source of errors in forming rules; to say nothing of the inconvenience of notes added to remind us that *τρ*=tch, *ρα*=cha, *σκα*=cha, *κκιοι*=στυ, which are found constantly in Deville.

Deffner uses in his grammar the alphabet which he prepared for his *Neograeca* from the works of Lepsius, Brücke, and Rumpelt, with the addition of some diacritical marks. This is based upon the Roman alphabet with γ, χ, δ (*th*-sonant as in *this*), θ (*th* surd as in *think*). *Th* and *ch* he reserves for the true aspirated consonants (as in *hot-house*, &c.), which had been neglected by former observers. It would, perhaps, have been as well if he had taken the Greek alphabet as his basis.

Deffner compares the motley character of the language at present to the dress of the women of the country. The old women wear a long home-made garment of black wool; the women of middle life wear a dress of the same style, but of red color, while the young ladies have their dresses made at Athens by a Parisian dressmaker. So in the language we find words and forms of a high antiquity side by side with others which have been introduced recently, through the schools and intercourse with the other Greeks. The language is constantly changing. Thus most substantives have now but one case for the singular and one for the plural. The old people preserve the genitive case of some words, and occasionally an accusative. We wonder that anything has been preserved from the classical period until we learn or recall the topography of the district. These mountain villages on the east coast of Peloponnesus between Nauplia and Cape Malea are so shut in by the sea and the hills that they have rarely suffered from invasion, and served as a place of refuge for the Greeks who were driven from more accessible regions by the Slavs and Albanians.

Many Laconian glosses of Hesychius illustrate or are illustrated by this dialect. Other glosses where the dialect is not named are shown to be Laconian. Our knowledge of the Doric dialect of Sparta receives a valuable supplement. The illustrations are given carefully by Deffner, who notes, as had his predecessors, the difference of the dialects of the towns Lenidhi (Λεωνίδιον) and Castanitsa (so named from the chestnut woods near it).

Touching the accent, it is interesting to note that as the Dorians said ἄνθρωπος but ἄνθρώποι, so the Tsacnians say ἄνθρωπο, ἀνθρώπι, and ἄμβελε (ἄμβελος), ambéle.

The digamma is retained with the pronunciation of *v* in a few words. Initial *F* is retained with this pronunciation only in *vāne* (Φανίον). *a* is retained in stem and endings (but a critic in the *Ἀθήναιον* thinks Deffner goes too far in this). *v* is retained in many words as ἄνγυρα, ἄγκυρα, ἀρυῖγα, λάρυγξ. *η* preserves its primitive sound in *sidere*, σίδηρος, &c. In nine words initial *s* corresponds to the ancient Greek θ, as *sèri* θέρος ('harvest-time,' not 'summer'). This reminds us at once of the Laconian peculiarity as we learn it from inscriptions, Alcman, Aristophanes, etc. But for Laconian σάλασσα, the Tsacnion has θάσσα; for σιός or σιόρ, it has θεό. Deffner's explanation or theory is that in Greece generally at the time of Aristophanes, θ was a true aspirate, but the Lacedaemonians had begun to pronounce it like our *th* in *think*. Since there was no characteristic sign for this sound it was expressed approximately by ζ.

Σ was dropped between two vowels; cf. *Mōā* · *Μοῦσα*. It was also put out of the way by rhotacismus at the end of a word (and this is retained in

Tsaconian where the following word begins with a vowel), and by assimilation. This assimilation is such as Hesychius notices in his gloss ἀκκόρ · ἀσκόρ · Λάκωνες. From the Tsaconian form we can often infer a Laconian assimilation which has not been recorded.

In his chapter on Vocalism, Deffner treats of the ι (ē) sound, and shows by calculation that this is not the most frequent vowel sound in the Tsaconian and Modern Greek (as spoken by the people, not the artificial imitation of the ancient language which has been adopted in the schools and by the higher classes of society); α and ε are more frequent.

The etymology of the name Τζάκωνες remains a puzzle. Oeconomus and Mullach urged its derivation from Κάκωνες. This has been generally rejected. Deville derives Τζακωνία from τραχόνιν, which is found in an old chronicle in the sense of 'steep,' an adjective which would be applicable to the country. This is rejected by Kind, who brings forward four words in which, as he thinks, initial Τζ in modern Greek corresponds to λ in ancient Greek. But one of these, τζάρουκις · λάρνγξ has the form ἀρουῖα in Tsaconian. Deffner, in the Berlin Academy Bericht, rejects Deville's etymology, since in Tsaconian Τζ cannot come from τρ, and proposes τ(ὸν)ς Λάκωνας (then the λ is dropped as often in Tsaconian), comparing Stamboul (τς τὴν πόλιν) and Stanchio (τς τὴν Χίον). Of this, perhaps wisely, he says nothing in his grammar.

Dr. Deffner's enthusiasm for his subject is manifest in every chapter. Many of his combinations and derivations are bold, and we are not ready to follow him everywhere, but in the main his method is scientific; his work of registering sounds seems accurate, as his care is manifest; and his results are valuable. We hope that his advertisement, that supplements and corrections will appear speedily in his *Archiv*, does not mean that the grammar is not to be completed soon.

He advertises also, as to be ready about May 1st, a book in the modern Greek language on Tsaconia, a description of the country and its history, and the life and customs of the people. The volume will be in quarto form, 350 pages, with more than 125 woodcuts. The subscription price is 20 drachmae, bound and post free; later the price is to be raised to 30 drachmae.

T. D. S.

P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibis. Ex novis codicibus edidit, scholia vetera, commentarium cum Prolegomenis, Appendice, Indice addidit R. ELLIS. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCCLXXXI.

Mr. Ellis, in his preface, gives an account of the accident which led to this edition of the Ibis. While exploring the Bodleian after the completion of his monumental edition of Catullus, he stumbled on a rare book, the *Repertorium Vocabulorum Exquisitorum*, composed in the year 1273, by Conrad de Mure, of Zurich, and printed in the XVth century by a certain Bertoldus, of Bâle. This book he found to contain an alphabetical list of names occurring in Greek and Roman myths, with the stories themselves,

and the passages in which the stories are told by Vergil, Lucan, Statius, and especially by Ovid. Besides the *Metamorphoses* and the *Epistles*, the *Ibis* is cited; and this rare find, which was equivalent to an old manuscript, led Mr. Ellis to study the *Ibis* more closely—a work more frequently alluded to than read. It belongs to the same mental shelf as the *Alexandra* of Lykophron, and few are the scholars who have seriously grappled with its difficulties. The search for better MSS. brought Mr. Ellis to the knowledge of two which border the XIIth century, a *Cantabrigiensis* (G), and a *Turonensis* (T); and not satisfied with these, although they were nearly sufficient for restoring the text, he added the *Phillippicus* 1796, and the *Parisinus* 7994.

Mr. Ellis, equipped for his difficult task by large and varied reading, and by an intimate acquaintance with the Roman elegiac poets, who, like their Alexandrian models, delight in all manner of learned allusions, and favored by the possession of better manuscripts and new scholia, has presented us in this volume with an edition of the *Ibis* which will be considered final, so far as editions are ever final. Certainly no one will dispute the claim which he makes at the close of his preface: *Si in Nuce laudatur Wilamowitzius, in Epicedio Huebnerus, in Haliuticis Birtius, in Epistula Sapphus Comparettus, possum mihi vel maiorem laudem adrogare, qui ad Ibin, opus non leve et in quo maxima ingenia elaborarint, philologos iterum revocaverim.*

Perhaps some American specialist may reveal himself to whom the *Ibis* is a familiar book. Meantime, a preliminary account may be of some interest to those who have never had time to puzzle over the poem itself. Many years ago my attention was called to it by a passage in Niebuhr, and I have occasionally made use of it as a test. It is by no means a pleasant test. Niebuhr recommends "the study of it to any scholar who wishes to ascertain whether he is thoroughly conversant with poetical mythology and ancient history," and as a cure for self-conceit it is sovereign.

Ovid was banished, it will be remembered, in 761 or 762 A. U. C., and in the fresh bitterness of his misfortune composed the *Ibis*—an elaborate malediction of some unfaithful friend, who had slandered him in public, and had disturbed the sacred grief of his wife. Who that traitor was does not appear. In the lazy way in which hypotheses are often accepted, the recreant friend is perhaps most commonly supposed to be Hyginus, the librarian and fabulist, just as many people associate Sir Philip Francis with Junius, though they have no reason for the faith that is in them. Mr. Ellis disposes of Hyginus. Hyginus was a Spaniard, not an Egyptian, and an Egyptian we must have; Hyginus was too old to have been a boy when Ovid was a boy; he was too dignified to have behaved in the unseemly manner that Ovid describes so drastically. We must not seek the villain in the decorous head-librarian; he is some orator or informer. There was no lack of lampoonists, rabid declaimers, loose tongues and loose principles in that age, and Mr. Ellis calls up a number of them and discusses them at length, but dismisses them all. Cassius Severus was too famous. Had the *Ibis* been aimed at him we should certainly have known it. Titus Labienus (with

his *summa egestas, summa infamia, summum odium*) is dropped, one hardly sees why, in favor of Thrasyllus, the famous astrologer-in-ordinary of Tiberius; but Thrasyllus is in turn forsaken. We are richer by some sketches of noteworthy figures of the Augustan time, but no nearer a conclusion; and Mr. Ellis carries his suspense of judgment so far as to admit the possibility that Ovid himself did not know—which seems to me the only untenable hypothesis, unless indeed Ovid was not the author of the poem. Ovid's crime or fault or blunder, or whatever it may be called, his seeing too much—which, by the way, is a very common philological sin—passes next under discussion in the *Prolegomena*, and Mr. Ellis thinks that while the light-hearted poet was violating the sanctity of the temple of Isis, he became an eye-witness of some of Julia's escapades, and thus made himself guilty of a double offence. Mr. Ellis points out many allusions to the worship and mysteries of Isis in the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Ovid is a second Osiris. Ovid is a shipwrecked mariner, and of such Isis is the tutelar goddess.

The notion of the *Ibis*, the movement, so to speak, Ovid borrowed from Kallimachos. Kallimachos was in high favor with the Romans, and his name occurs in other elegiac poems. When they are tired of calling him 'Callimachus,' they call him 'Battiades,' which has a finer effect and a more resonant close. Kallimachos was a scholar rather than a 'genius. *Battiades toto semper cantabitur orbe, quamvis ingenio non valet arte valet.* But the Romans liked such half-poets, half-pedants—because they could put life into their imitations of them. It is much easier to galvanize Lytton's Richelieu than to conceive Shakespeare's Lear. But scholars and pedants are not without feeling. If their love is shallow and frosty, their hate is deep and hot, and Kallimachos was much incensed with his younger contemporary Apollonios, the author of the *Argonautica*. Kallimachos thought that the time for long poems had passed, and when Apollonios composed an elaborate epic, Kallimachos, 'that fribble, that heap of rubbish, that mind of wood,' as Apollonios is supposed to have called him—took fire and blazed out against the audacious violator of his Newdigate canon. Forced to withdraw, Apollonios took refuge in Rhodes, but the quarrel did not cease with his withdrawal, and Kallimachos wreaked his vengeance on him by composing the *Ibis*, in which he devoted his enemy to all the infernal gods, and called down on him all the tortures that he could rake up out of his extensive stock of mythological miseries—a pillory and a puzzle on each hand. This is the poem on which Ovid based his *Ibis*, which seems to be a much more elaborate work than the original was, and to have taken up into its elastic structure much material from other sources. It is a dismal catalogue of men and heroes who have been blinded, torn by wild horses, struck by lightning, betrayed by their wives, drowned in the sea, bitten by serpents, devoured by wild beasts, thrown into wells, crushed by falling houses, shut up in cages, wedged in trees. It is a mythological and historical catechism of bad endings. The opening of the poem is the only part in which the poet shows his real power as a poet, the rest is ingenuity of the clever Ovidian pattern, and perhaps the admirers of Ovid will not regret that

the Ovidian authorship is not by any means absolutely established. In a special chapter, Mr. Ellis has discussed with abundance of interesting detail the name which Kallimachos gave to his poem. The ibis, which is supposed to represent Apollonios, was fabled to be a bird of singularly unclean habits, a serpent-eater and a scavenger of unparalleled voracity, endowed with all manner of unlovely peculiarities in its internal structure, a long-lived creature, whose hateful existence was protected by law. It was death to kill an ibis, for the bird was sacred to Hermes (Theuth) and to the moon (Hah). In modern books the ibis appears in a more amiable light, but the ibis of antiquity had to suffer for being a townsman of the enemy of Kallimachos, for Naukratis was the special haunt of the ibis as it was the home of Apollonios. The view which Kallimachos gave of the ibis was the Greek and not the Egyptian view, and Mr. Ellis sees in this a special malice of the poet, who wished to intimate that his adversary was a Greek and not a barbarian. But I cannot yield any further to the temptation of giving a résumé of Mr. Ellis's interesting *Prolegomena*, in which he has discussed the sources of Ovid, the distribution of the fables, the special allusions to Egypt, the influence of the poem, the manuscripts and the scholia. In his preface he has done ample justice to the marvellous erudition of Salvaing (Salvagnius), who when a mere youth prepared an edition of the Ibis which is a wonder of industry, acumen and learning. *Annum agens ætatis vicesimum* seems almost incredible, but the astonishment with which the revelation of Charles Graux's age has filled most of us, may teach older men to be less critical of similar claims. Those who know Mr. Ellis's manner of work will not be surprised at what may be called, without disrespect, an occasional perversity in his notes, critical and exegetical, perversity due to his restless desire of exploring every side of a subject and to a certain superfluous subtlety. So he makes *facis in sicut facis* v. 357 a verb, and has an evident leaning to Neubauer's incredible *mabor* (מִעֲבֹר) v. 418. But in view of the enormous difficulty of the task accomplished, faultfinding in small details would be invidious, and is at any rate excluded from these pages for want of space. Scholars will all thank Mr. Ellis for bringing out the Ibis from its hiding-place; and his commentary, learned and ingenious, will add to the great reputation which he has gained by his memorable edition of Catullus, which in this country at least has been allowed to take its place among the standards without any special recognition of its great merits—such is the supineness of American criticism.

B. L. G.

THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER. Edited with marginal references, various readings, notes, appendices, and three facsimile plates. By HENRY HAYMAN, D. D., Rector of Aldingham, Lancashire, &c. Vol. III. Books XIII to XXIV. London: David Nutt, 270 Strand. 1882.

We have now for the first time a complete edition of the Odyssey with English notes, which makes reasonable pretension to take rank among works of modern scholarship. Dr. Hayman's first volume appeared in 1866, the second

in 1873, and here is the third and last. It is much to his credit that he has had the pluck to go on with this laborious task after the unfortunate quarrel which resulted in his dismissal in 1874 from the head-mastership of Rugby. The book is plainly designed for the use of advanced scholars, aiming to establish a text, and to serve as a storehouse of learning and opinion on all points connected with the poem. The labor and patience shown in the work done are worthy of the highest praise in themselves. We are driven to borrow the old word *χαλκέντερος* (which we once heard a Greek in Athens apply to George Grote) to express our admiration of the sturdy stomach for work to which this book bears testimony. Still it labors somewhat under the mass of loose learning in it. The page is overcrowded, so that one cannot use it with comfort for rapid reading. It carries first the text, in which the *ἀπαξ εἰρημένα* are spaced, then a close column of marginal references, then a horizontal line or two of digammated words, then several more such lines occupied with critical notes, and finally two columns of explanatory notes. Reference to the margin is made by small English letters, which still further disturb one's comfort in reading the Greek. In this respect it compares unfavorably with Merry's edition, which when completed will be its natural rival.

The principal value of Hayman's edition we find in these marginal references. So far as we remember, this plan has not before been adopted in any edition of a classical author, although familiar in what are or used to be called reference Bibles. It offends the eye, we must say, on the page of Homer, but it will be of great use to a close student of the language of the poems. The references are confined, so far as we have observed, to the recurrence of similar phrases in one or the other of the two Homeric poems. This seems to be a wise restriction, for the rest of Greek literature is apparently so much later and so much influenced by these poems that illustrations drawn from it are comparatively useless. Of course, everything depends on the judgment with which such references are selected, and in this respect Dr. Hayman appears to have done pretty well. In comparison with this part of the apparatus, the exegetical notes are of no great value. We notice a number of purely grammatical notes, which ought to be needless for the mature scholars for whom as a whole the book seems designed. If we should try to put into one word the impression we get of the character of this edition, we should describe it as old-fashioned. This term is not necessarily one of disparagement. Even in philology, some things are better in so far as they are old-fashioned, and so every one is at liberty to interpret it here as suits himself. It is old-fashioned in its treatment of the text and of matters connected with the structure of the poem, in its interpretation of myths, in its discussions of moral problems and questions of locality, &c., in its suggestions as to etymology. Without stopping to illustrate all these points, we will explain our meaning as to the first. Dr. Hayman seems to find hardly any difficulty in regard to the unity of the poem, but he is ready at all times with the suggestion that a line or two which conflicts with some other "may easily be spared." This method may be quite as legitimate as that which considers it necessary to give a reason for assuming an interpolation besides the desire to get rid of a line, but it is distinctly less in the present fashion. In other cases he simply ignores the difficulties that have been pointed out. Thus, at the beginning of the fifteenth book there is no

notice taken of the awkward joining of the Telemachos story with the Odysseus story or of the resulting hitch in the order of days.

There remains an important part of the work not yet mentioned, the prefaces and appendices, which take up about 600 pages of the 1700 in the three volumes. The preface to the first volume is occupied with a partial discussion of the Homeric question, and an account of the Homeric scholars in ancient times. This last is full of minute detail and will be found useful for reference. The same volume contains a series of appendices on the language, geography, and characters of the poem, which are of unequal value, the essays on the characters being the most interesting. The appearance of Paley's *Iliad* shortly before the publication of Hayman's second volume gave a new turn to the latter's meditations, and he has devoted the prefaces of his second and third volumes to a discussion of Paley's theory of the date of the Homeric poems and of the literary use of the art of writing. Very likely some persons may think that theory hardly worthy of so extensive discussion, but as a pestilent heresy backed by a well-known name, it seems to us to deserve a thorough refutation. And after what Dr. Hayman has said upon it, to say nothing of other opponents, it has hardly a leg left to stand on. But we do object to having this long discussion incorporated into an edition of Homer. Those who want the Homer ought not to be compelled to pay for 300 additional pages of matter on a subject which has very little to do with the explanation of the author, and on the other hand the few who desire these essays will think it hard to have to buy the three volumes on Homer for the sake of the two prefaces. In another respect, too, Dr. Hayman has done unwisely in following Mr. Paley's lead (in his *Hesiod*), and that is in printing at the foot of every page of text a list of the digammated words in that page. A glance at Seber's Index under the forms of *ἔπος, εἶπον, εἶδον*, &c., will show what a great waste of ink and space in needless repetitions this practice involves. If the existence of the digamma had been discovered only twenty years ago, as one would imagine from the way in which some English scholars treat it, this might be necessary, but surely it is folly now.

L. R. P.

ANECDOTA OXONIENSIA: Texts, Documents, and Extracts chiefly from manuscripts in the Bodleian and other Oxford Libraries. Classical Series. Vol. I, Part I. Contents: The English manuscripts of the Nicomachean Ethics described by J. A. STEWART, A. M. 91 pp. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1882.

The Oxford authorities have begun to publish materials, chiefly inedited, taken direct from MSS., those preserved in the Bodleian and other Oxford Libraries to have the first claim to publication. The first part of Vol. I of the Classical Series contains Mr. Stewart's collations of six English MSS. of the Ethics, so much read and studied in England. Of three of these MSS. collations have not been hitherto published. The other three cannot be said to have been collated according to the exacting standard of modern manuscript-readers.

The three not before collated are MSS. in the British Museum (B¹ saec. xv, B² saec. xv, B³ saec. xvi). A is a manuscript in the Cambridge University Library (No. 1879, I i, v. 44), saec. xiii, the Eliensis of Wilkinson, Zell and Michelet, O³ of Susemihl. C is a MS. in the Library of Corpus Christi College, saec. xv, the CCC of Wilkinson, Zell and Michelet, O¹ of Susemihl. D is in the Library of New College, Oxford, saec. xv, the NC of Wilkinson, Zell and Michelet, O² of Susemihl.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY. Vol. I, from 1872 to 1880. Edited by J. P. POSTGATE, M. A., Honorary Secretary. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

The Cambridge Philological Society has done well to publish its papers in a collected form. The difficulty of getting at scattered monographs is one of the greatest of philological troubles. Of course there is much in these papers that is merely tentative, much that is mere suggestion, but there are several elaborate and valuable articles, and the newly introduced feature of reviewing the literature of various classical authors during the current year will be peculiarly acceptable to English scholars. Such reviews are to be found in various German periodicals; as notably in the *Philologus*; and Bursian's *Jahresbericht* is especially devoted to this function, but the latter repertory comes out in so extraordinary a fashion—each part containing the *disiecta membra* of various volumes skewered together—that it is necessary to wait a long time before any one volume can be made available. It is much to be desired that this feature of the Transactions should be made prominent and increasingly useful.

In another part of this Journal the reader will find a list of the articles published in the Transactions for 1879-1880. An index to the whole volume is much to be wished, but hardly to be expected in the circumstances.

Professor Postgate has introduced the volume by a vindication of the *raison d'être* of the society, and has emphasized its *maieutic* function, the interchange of help, the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the literature of the various subjects under consideration, and the consequent saving of time otherwise wasted in fruitless and *rem actam agere* researches, the collection of lexicographical material, the discussion of those educational problems that grow out of philological studies, and the initiation of needed reforms. To this excellent presentation of the functions of a Philological Society I would add the testimony of my own experience. The institution of a Philological Association in connection with the Johns Hopkins University has been fruitful of good in nearly all the directions indicated by Professor Postgate. It has brought together workers from different parts of the same field, it has stimulated production, it has promoted mutual good feeling and mutual respect. The interest of our monthly meetings is not abated, and our experience is not of yesterday—for we shall soon reach our fortieth session—and I am confident that by the institution of similar associations in every centre of philological study in America, the development of the department would be accelerated beyond

the dreams of the most sanguine. But the society must be philological; it must deal with truly philological themes, and not lose itself in vague generalities, and it must be an organic part of the university or the college work. In communities where there is already a large philological element this latter feature may not be essential, but it seems to be clear that if a certain responsibility were not felt by each philologist here to his department as well as to the members of the association, there would not be the same activity or the same persistency. The example of the Cambridge Philological Society will serve to encourage and stimulate us to still more earnest efforts, even if we cannot hope to show evidence of studies so rich and so varied.

B. L. G.

Elis Saga ok Rosamundu. Mit Einleitung, deutscher Uebersetzung und Anmerkungen zum ersten Mal herausgegeben von EUGEN KÖLBING. Heilbronn (Henninger), 1881. 8°. Pp. XLI+217.

Tales of the Crusades and knight-errantry form a part of mediaeval romantic literature, the cultivation of which culminated at the beginning of the 12th century. Original to France, they soon spread to every part of Europe; into Norway, under the title of Riddara Sögur, they were introduced with the middle of the 13th century, and spread thence to Iceland, where during the 14th and 15th centuries most of the Scandinavian versions were written. The Riddara Sögur are more or less free prose translations and paraphrases from Latin, French, Anglo-Norman and German originals either in prose or verse; they are, however, principally from French and Anglo-Norman poems whose originals are in many cases lost. The Elis Saga, as the author states in his preface, is one of the most important, as its Old French versified original is still extant; it is the only one, with the exception of the Strengleikar (Lais)—Munch & Unger, Christiania, 1850—whose Old Norwegian version exists and the name of its translator is known. Prof. Kölbings book contains an introduction with MS. and text exegesis, the text with variants followed by a translation and notes, and indexes of the names of persons, places and peoples. The Elis Saga consists of two separate parts—the Elis Saga proper (pp. 1-116), which goes back to an Old French original, and a Continuation (pp. 116-139). The author of the first part is, as the MS. itself states, "the Abbot Robert," who made the translation for the Norwegian king Hakon Hakonson (1217-63). The second part is apparently the later original work of an unknown Iclander, a view shared by Klockhoff and Edzardi, though Raynaud thinks the same Abbot Robert to have been its author. The saga is contained in nine different parchment MSS., in but one of them, however, entire. The oldest and best of them, called by the author *A*, is the Cod. Delagard. 4-7 fol. of the University Library at Upsala, written in Norway in the middle of the 13th century; *B* is Cod. Holm. 6, 4°; *C* Cod. A. M. 533, 4°; *D* is Cod. Holm. 7 fol. from the second half of the 15th century, and is the only MS. which has the saga entire; *E F H I J* are fragments. The relationship of the MS. is as follows: *A* is assumed—certainly on rather insufficient grounds—to be but a transcript from an older MS.; *C B* form a group by themselves, and are from a common Icelandic original; *D* is a paraphrase by an Iclander of

an old MS., not however, identical with *A*. The MSS. of the second part form two groups, *CBFH* and *D*; the original is, however, not extant. The printed text of the saga aims to be an exact orthographic copy of *A*, so far as it is extant; a lacuna of two leaves in the MS. (pp. 46-59) is filled from *C*, the second best MS. Following the text on every page are variants from *CB* and *EF* in normalized orthography. *D* is printed *in extenso* at the bottom of the page in a normalized form. The text of the Continuation is after *C*; a lacuna (pp. 129-134) is filled from *B*; the last page, illegible in the MS. (pp. 138-139), is also after *B(D)*; the last five lines of the text are after *H*; variants from *BD* follow the text on each page. The peculiar value of Prof. Kömings's work is, of course, the publication of the MS. *A*, whose Norwegian orthography he has judiciously followed—how correctly will not appear until the printed text is compared with the MS. by Swedish critics. A detailed list of the dialectic peculiarities of the MS. ought certainly to have been given in the introduction. Instead of this the author very conveniently refers in a footnote to a forthcoming book by some one else. *ö*, represented in the text by *æ*, performs a double function in the MS. and should have been retained to the exclusion of such forms as *kæmr*, *mændi*, etc. The normalized orthography of the variants is marred by the differentiation of *æ* and *æ* contrary to the MSS. and the omission of *ö* of the MSS.—printed *o*. As both, however, are mentioned in the introduction they cannot mislead. The same may be said of two or three inconsistencies in the orthography of *D*, where forms of the word *kongr* are given by the older uncontracted *konungr* which is obsolete; *ll* and not *l* should stand before dentals in *mæltti*, *mæltt*, *skalltu*, *skyllði*. The book aside from these few faults bears throughout the marks of careful labor and discrimination, and ranks as a scientific work far above the author's *Riddara Sögur* (Strassburg and London, 1872). With the *Elis Saga* the author, as he states in his preface, closes his labors in Old Norse philology, a field where he has done abundant work, and where he will be reluctantly missed.

W. H. CARPENTER.

SOPHOCLES. Edited, with English notes and introductions, by Lewis Campbell, M. A., LL. D., Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrews. In two volumes. Vol. II: *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Trachiniae*, *Philoctetes*, *Fragments*. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1881.

Professor Campbell published Vol. I of his edition of Sophocles first in 1871 and again in 1879. A second edition of Vol. I was called for while Vol. II was still in preparation. This delay in the appearance of Vol. II was in some ways fortunate. Professor Campbell was thus enabled to reconsider the principles on which his work is based in the light of the criticisms elicited by Vol. I. The present volume exemplifies, it may fairly be concluded, the editor's matured conception of such an edition of Sophocles as he has proposed to himself—one, he says, which does not aim at the completeness of Boeckh's *Pindar*, but whose plan is rather that proposed by Hermann in his preface to the *Ajax*, "*quod instituerat Erfurdinus, ut haec editio et adolescentium studiis accommodata esset, neque exclusa ab usu doctorum hominum.*" The criticisms

mentioned were numerous, a fact on which the editor doubtless congratulated himself, since it proves, on the well-known principle, the substantial value of his work. One of these, that of the regius professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, summed up finally in his *Studia Sophoclea*, Part I, is phenomenal among English reviews on account of its ferocity, and reminds one of the lamented Krüger. Dr. Kennedy's implacable and magisterial manner tempts Professor Campbell, who, with a Scotchman's power of resistance, refuses to be convinced, somewhere to remark with Socratic irony, ὦ γενναῖε, πρῶτον μὲν προδίδασκε, ἵνα μὴ ἀποφοιτήσω ἀπὸ σοῦ.

The complete work has magnitude. It covers over 1200 octavo pages, and includes an introductory essay on the language of Sophocles of more than 100 pages, a full list of the MSS., with an examination of the question how the chief MS. stands related to the rest, introductions to the seven plays and to the fragments, a revision of the text, and continuous interpretation of this text in notes put where they always should be put, on the lower half of the same page.

This volume appears only a little later than Professor Paley's edition of the same four plays in the *Bibliotheca Classica*. Thus two complete editions of Sophocles have appeared in England since the first publishing of the last complete edition in Germany. Such literary activity is creditable to English scholarship; and one's satisfaction is increased by the rumor of another complete edition of the poet by Professor Jebb, to be published soon by the Cambridge University Press.

It is a relief to conservative scholars to know that both Professor Campbell and Professor Paley have refused to follow the principles laid down by C. G. Cobet, whose brilliant work in the field of conjectural criticism compels our admiration, though it fails to win our assent to his sweeping condemnation of existing Greek MSS.; and that in establishing their text of Sophocles they have not fallen into the dark errors of a school that will tolerate no deviation from its preconceived notions of Greek grammar, but ruthlessly squares the author in hand to its own ideas of what he should have written. The outcome of this principle is seen at its worst in the vagaries of Mr. Blaydes, the editor of the first volume on Sophocles in the *Bibliotheca Classica*, who to his discredit may fairly be said to have rewritten his author, "dealing with him as 'an accomplished master would treat the iambic exercises of an advanced pupil.'"¹ Professor Campbell, on the contrary, has adopted but few conjectures into the text of the plays,—twenty-one, by count, in the *Ajax*, two-thirds of which are in lyrical passages,—and these with few, if any, exceptions belong to Mr. Paley's category of corrections, "self-evidently either right or necessary," and have behind them the authority of great names. His critical apparatus is excellent, open to the apprehension of even an "adolescens," and sure to induce in him habits of proper respect for the authority of the MSS. There is no better edition than this with which to begin to study the text of Sophocles. The editor gives, perhaps, too much weight to the inferior MSS. There are occasional places where I think he would have done better to follow L. In *Phil.* 493, 494,² he is undoubtedly

¹ In the hands of such an editor,—οὐδαμοῦ τιμαῖς *Σοφοκλῆς ἐμφανής* ἔρρει δὲ τὰ θεῖα.

² He reads,—

πατρί μ' ὥς δείξης φίλῳ,
ὅν δὴ παλαῖ, ἂν ἐξότου δέδοικ' ἐγὼ
μή μοι βεβήκη.

right in reading *παλαῖ ἄν*, and should have followed it up with *βεβήκοι*, completely parting company with the editors and adopting the reading of L. His text as it stands can hardly be interpreted. The supposition that *εἰη* is to be supplied is untenable, and in connecting the phrase *παλαῖ ἄν ἐξότου* with the last verb in the sentence he has himself supplied the key. If the particle *ἄν* is read, it belongs to *βεβήκοι*. The passage means,—“I fear that he would prove to be¹ long since gone.” Trach. 631 furnishes an exact parallel in the use of the mood to *δέδοικα μὴ βεβήκοι ἄν*.

It would be surprising if in a work of such magnitude as this the critic did not find what he regarded errors of commission and omission for which to bring the editor to book. It may not, for example—to continue with the Philoctetes—be ungracious to doubt whether Professor Campbell's note on 567² will gain credence. The passage when put side by side with vv. 253, 415, Elec. 1341, Trach. 289, can have but one interpretation. To supply *ἐστίν* here would be unusually harsh, and the order is adequately accounted for by the antithesis between *δρώμενα* and *μέλλοντα*. In none of these passages has the editor explained, or even noted, the subtle force of *ὥς*. He has also omitted any explanation of the rare aorists optative in 281, 282; and in the note on 961, the reference on *πρὶν μάθοιμι* (the mood does need explanation) to the note on 325 is not wholly satisfactory, since there is no note on 325.

Is it clear, further, in Ajax 1083 that *πεσεῖν* “denotes what is certain in the future,” and that it is not a gnomic aorist? Aesch. Prom. 667—cited as a parallel—since it involves a special reference to a particular person, is logically a very different case from this where the speaker gives utterance to a universal truth.³ Professor Campbell refuses to follow Elmsley's lead in making Trach. 979 interrogative. If he had not, such a passage as Phil. 381 would have presented insuperable difficulties. It would have been better, perhaps, if he had gone further and made such passages as Ajax 75 and Trach. 1183 also affirmative. Whether he would explain these as Professor Jebb does (on Ajax 75), or take the more logical view of making the second question independent of the *οὐ*, is uncertain. He has nothing to say on *οὐ μή* either in his notes on these places or in his introductory essay.

Professor Campbell occupies a singular position in regard to Greek metres. He mentions Rossbach and Westphal, and gives a hint of Heinrich Schmidt; he has partially and with some hesitation, he says, made use of terminology which has of late become current in Germany; but he does not wish to be understood as committing himself to any positive judgment. When, therefore, he speaks of syncope or an irrational syllable, he does not mean it. He adopts into his work the metrical sign of the triseme long syllable, but if you disbelieve in the existence or importance of such metrical phenomena you may pass it by; as for himself, according to his own statement, he is making up his mind. I do not wish to jest about a serious matter—for Professor Campbell has lost an excellent opportunity to enlighten a great many persons on an important subject—but surely all this is surprising.

¹ Cf. Thuc. i. 9, αὐται δὲ οὐκ ἂν πολλὰ εἴησαν. The conjecture *βεβήκε* is wholly unnecessary.

² ὥς ταῦτ' ἐπίστω δρώμεν', οὐ μέλλοντ' ἔτι.

³ Plat. Rep. 490 C is a parallel passage: ἡγουμένης δὲ ἀληθείας οὐκ ἂν ποτε, οἶμαι, φαίμεν αὐτῇ χορὸν κακῶν ἀκολουθήσαι.

Since Rossbach's book on *Griechische Rhythmik* appeared in 1854 the whole question of Greek rhythms has had a restatement; the literature of the subject is now formidable and deterrent. But the editor of so important a work as this may well be called upon to declare his opinion. Does he still believe in the existence of the twenty-eight feet recorded in that venerable book, the *Epitome Doctrinae Metricae*, or has he adopted the doctrine of syncope? Does he agree that the choruses of Sophocles were written to be sung, and agreeing, does he believe that the Greeks, differently from all the moderns, were able to shift within the compass of a few bars from triple to common, from three-eighths to five-eighths, time, and back again, and still have a melody? Professor Campbell in the division of the lines has refused to follow "recent innovations," and has nothing to say of the eurhythmical relations of the parts of the strophes to one another. Was Theodor Bergk, therefore, wrong when he said to Rossbach in 1847, "dass eine jede griechische Strophe ein Kunstwerk im vollen Sinne des Wortes sei, wo Alles auf architectonischer Gliederung beruhe und wo es nicht bloss auf den einzelnen Vers ankomme, sondern vor Allem darauf, wie der Vers zur Totalität der rhythmischen Composition passt"?

J. W. W.

REPORTS.

ANGLIA. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. IV Band, 2, 3 u. 4 Hefte. Halle, 1881.

II.—According to the new arrangement, Nos. 1 and 3 of the Anglia will contain essays and be edited by Prof. Wülcker, Leipzig; Nos. 2 and 4, book reviews, edited by Prof. Trautmann, Bonn. No. 2 opens with a full bibliography of books and essays in English philology which appeared in the years 1877, '78, '79.

Miss L. T. Smith presents a brief, but appreciative, notice of Prof. Dowden's Southey in the English Men of Letters series.

Wülcker follows with a review of Brother Azarias's Development of English Literature: Old English Period. He examines each chapter separately, and finds much to object to. His judgment of it as a whole is that there is little in it to praise. He considers it "vollständig veraltet," and charges that the latest German works on the subjects of which it treats have been completely neglected. A work on Anglo-Saxon literature cannot afford to neglect ten Brink's Geschichte der Englischen Literatur, I.

F. Kluge notices Zupitza's edition of Aelfric's Grammatik und Glossar, Erste abtheilung, text und varianten; and the second edition of his Alt- und Mittelenglisches Uebungsbuch. He praises both, but takes exception to the quantity of certain words as marked by Zupitza, and thinks that he has not always carried out his own principles consistently.

U. Zernial gives a very favorable review of Körner's Einleitung in das Studium des Angelsächsischen, II teil: Text, übersetzungen, glossar—notwithstanding the philological quarrel to which it has given occasion between Zupitza and Körner. After noticing at some length the extracts, translation, notes and glossary, he thinks that it fulfils its object well, but that the old principle of *ne quid nimis* has not been sufficiently regarded in the notes. He objects to some of the explanations, and gives his own views on these points, but on the whole recommends the book very cheerfully, as indeed it deserves, though I should think it would have been better, in a book intended for students, to dispense with the translation, as the notes and glossary furnish all requisite assistance in the elucidation of the text.

G. Tanger contributes the longest review on The First Quarto Edition of Hamlet, 1603: Two Harness Prize Essays, 1880. I. by C. H. Herford, B. A., and II. by W. H. Widgery, B. A. Tanger regrets that the results of the investigation of the Hamlet-question are as contradictory as ever. In his own studies (Part I published in Anglia IV 211, reported in this Journal, II 386; Parts II and III, in the Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society, June, 1881) he reached the conclusion that Q₂ is very probably printed from the poet's MS., the Folio from the actors' rolls, and Q₁ is pla-



giarized, whereas these two essays agree in regarding Q_1 as a first sketch by Shakspeare based on an original Hamlet (by Kyd, according to Widgery), and Q_2 as a later revision. I cannot follow the reviewer in his lengthy examination of the Essays, but must refer Shakspeare students to the article itself. He does not think that any new difficulties in the way of his theory are presented by these investigations.

A. Schröer notices briefly A. Würzner's Essay on Chaucer's Lyrical Poems, and Dr. John Koch's translations, in the metre of the originals, of Selected Minor Poems of Chaucer. He praises both works, especially the latter, and characterizes the translations as "vortrefflich."

J. Koch supplies corrections to his Selected Minor Poems of Chaucer, and M. Trautmann notices Müller's Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Englischen Sprache, zweite Auflage, and Skeat's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, Parts I, II and III. Each of these works has its advantages. Müller supplies the literature concerning the derivation of a word, and Skeat treats specially its historical relations. He gives the word *gnaw* as an example from each, and while both works admit of corrections in particulars, he thinks that is no reproach, as only gradually can an etymological dictionary become perfect. He supplies additions to the following words: *burr*, *catch*, *catcher*, *collop*, *deal*, *dusk*, *fag*, *fudge*, *lurk*, *mellow*, *painim*, *stark*.

M. Trautmann closes the number with Sievers's Grundzüge der Phonetik, a second edition of his Grundzüge der Lautphysiologie, in the heading, but the ten-page article says little about Sievers's work. It is devoted to an attack upon the vowel-system of Bell and Sweet, which Storm and Sievers follow, and an exposition of Trautmann's own system, with a defence of it vs. Bell's. I have not space here for even a summary of the objections to Bell's system, and of the arguments in favor of his own system which Trautmann presents, but phonetists must read the article. Trautmann should have supplied key-words, so that a layman might determine more readily what sounds some of his diacritics designate; but his system seems much simpler than Bell's, and has a natural basis, the notes of the musical scale. He insists strongly upon the fact that the positions of the mouth and the sound determine the vowels, and neither will alone suffice. He says: "Bell's vokalsystem ist ein system, aber ein so wanschaffnes, dass ich nicht begreife, wie es anhängen hat gewinnen können," and, as a consequence, "Der abschnitt, in welchem Sievers die vokale handelt, ist ohne allen wert." Trautmann thinks to justify his views in his forthcoming book, "Die Sprachlaute im Allgemeinen und die Laute des Französischen, Englischen und Deutschen im Besondern." Here we have a very decided opponent of the system of Bell and Sweet, which seemed to be carrying everything before it, so as to convert even Sievers. "It is a very pretty quarrel as it stands," and we can only await further developments.

III.—O. Collman begins the third number with an essay on Alexander Pope and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. He notices their correspondence, their quarrels, and Lord Hervey's attacks on Pope, and gives a more particular examination to the Letter to a Noble Lord, with the object, as it

seems, of refuting Macaulay's assertion that Pope "lied and equivocated," and Dr. Johnson's that "he was sometimes wanton in his attacks—and mean in his retreat." He thinks this letter shows that Pope did not retreat, but had the last word.

H. Breymann supplies some corrections to L. Proescholdt's Collation of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus, having himself examined carefully all the existing quartos, with a view to a new critical edition of the play.

W. Sattler continues his examples of the Use of Prepositions in Modern English with—XII, *free from, free of*; XIII, *by the help, with the help*; XIV, *with a vengeance*.

G. Schleich follows with Beitrage zum Mittelenglischen Roland. He had made this poem the subject of a Berlin doctor-dissertation, and Wissmann, in his recension of it, had combated Schleich's view that the poem belonged to the border between the southern and west-midland counties, assuming an eastern and northern origin for it. Schleich defends his view by comparing the Roland with the Ferumbras and with Trevisa in certain dialectic peculiarities. He had also assigned the copyist to the northeastern border of the midland, which view Herrtage, the editor of the poem, opposed, as also Schleich's implication as to the date of the poem. Schleich furnishes additional arguments for his opinion, and takes exception to Herrtage's explanation of the metre of the poem. The main body of the article is taken up with critical notes on the text of the Roland.

The pièce de résistance of this number is Th. Wissmann's Studien zu King Horn, but I cannot do more than transcribe the titles of the sections of his sixty-page article. Wissmann's views as to the relation of the different forms of the *Hornsage*, i. e. King Horn, Roman de Horn, and Horn Childe, as given in his Untersuchungen zu King Horn, have been criticized by Prof. Stimming in Englische Studien, I 357, so section I, Verhältniss der verschiedenen Fassungen, is devoted to substantiating these views; section II treats the Erziehung des Helden; III, Der Ritterschlag; IV, Bewaffnung. Kampf; V, Rittersitte; VI, Lebensart, Behausung; VII, Die Liebe; VIII, Die Gefährten des Helden; IX, Wunderbares; X, Christen und Heiden; XI, Bettler und Spielleute; XII, Schlusswort, in which Wissmann denies that we have here the original of the various similar sagas which were spread over northern and central Europe in the Middle Ages, but thinks that there was a kernel of genuine saga, how much it is hard to say, which was worked up by different minstrels according to circumstances. The manners and customs of the 12th, or at latest the first half of the 13th century, are delineated in this poem.

R. P. Wulcker has a brief article on Caedmon and Milton, in which he shows from Milton's History of England that Milton could not read Anglo-Saxon, in particular the poem on the battle of Brunanburh, even if by the help of Wheloc's Latin translation and Henry of Huntingdon he could understand the prose-text of the Chronicle. Possibly he might have been made acquainted with Caedmon and his works by Junius, but we have no

evidence of it, and he not even mentions what Beda says of Caedmon. Finally, if he had known Caedmon, he would have been guilty of a falsehood in saying that he will sing

"Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme."

J. Zupitza contributes some critical notes from a collation of the three MSS. (E., J., T.) of the *Poema Morale*, being reminded of them by the appearance of H. Lewin's edition of the poem.

A. Napier, on Andreas 1182, suggests *ealdorgeard*=*domus vitae*, *corpus*, for the *ealdorgeard* of Grimm and Grein.

Prof. W. W. Skeat and A. Schröder, on the Etymology of 'Catch,' defend the derivation from Old French *cachier*, so given in Skeat's, Müller's and Mätzner's dictionaries, as against Trautmann, who assumed (*Anglia*, IV 2, 52) its derivation from a supposed A. S. **ceccan* or **cæcan*.

H. Varnhagen, in *Kleine Bemerkungen, Nachträge, Besserungen*, gives passages from Early English works illustrating the use of bells on riding-horses.

O. Lohmann supplies *Nachträge zu Anglia* III 1; and A. Schröder, to *Anglia* IV 1.

C. Deutschbein contributes an obituary notice of Edward Müller, best known as author of the *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* already referred to above, who died on April 7, 1881.

A mutual explanation from Zupitza and Wülcker, consequent upon a remark of Kölbing's, closes this number. It seems that the rivalry between the *Englische Studien* and the *Anglia* is anything but generous, as the *odium philologicum* crops out occasionally.

IV.—R. P. Wülcker gives an interesting résumé of the translations of "Beowulf," in connection with Lumsden's recent translation, noticed in this *JOURNAL*, II 7, 355. He includes brief notices of Thorkelin's Latin, Grundtvig's and Schaldemose's Danish, Leo's (in part), Ettmüller's, Grein's, Simrock's, Heyne's, and von Wolzogen's German; Sandras's (in part) Latin, and Botkine's French; Kemble's, Thorpe's, and Arnold's prose, Conybeare's (in part), Wackerbarth's and Lumsden's metrical English translations. He mentions also Longfellow's translation of Canto III, about seventy lines, and Klipstein's announcement of an edition with version, which was never published, and says: "Eine vollständige Übertragung des Beowulf ist meines wissens in Amerika nicht erscheinen," which is true, although it is said that the late Prof. S. H. Carpenter prepared such a translation, and the present writer has completed one which may possibly see the light. While Lumsden's translation has a number of manifest errors, Wülcker thinks it is not injured thereby, as it is not written for students of Anglo-Saxon, but for the public, and he considers it a good and readable, though free, translation. He gives short extracts from Ettmüller, Heyne, von Wolzogen—the last in order to criticize it—Botkine, Conybeare, Wackerbarth, and Lumsden. This summary shows plainly the interest of scholars in our Anglo-Saxon epic.

Wülcker states in respect to his edition of Grein's *Bibliothek der A. S. Poesie*, of which the first half of the first volume has appeared, that he will give the accents of *Waldere* and *Beowulf* at the close of the first volume, and of those pieces in that volume not taken from the *Exeter-book*; the accents of the *Exeter-book* will be given at the end of the second volume. An alphabetical list of the accented words in the *Beowulf* MS. is given in this article. I think it a misfortune that Wülcker should have departed from Grein's own practice in respect to the accents, as I fail to see that anything is gained thereby.

Wülcker gives next a report of Kölbing's *Englische Studien*, III band, reported in this *JOURNAL*, II 545. The editorial differences already referred to appear here also. Wülcker notices lastly O. Brenner's German translation of S. Bugge's *Studien über die entstehung der nordischen götter- und heldensagen*, I heft. Bugge's work has excited much interest, as it attributes a great deal of the Edda-mythology to the influence exerted on the Vikings by the Christian schools in England, where Judæo-Christian and Graeco-Roman elements were united. Wülcker eagerly awaits the appearance of the other two parts, so that a judgment of the work as a whole can be formed.

E. Erlenknecht reviews very favorably H. Lewin's critical edition of the Middle-English *Poema Morale* from the six existing MSS. Apart from a few mistakes which he finds, he thinks the author has accomplished his object, and dismisses the book with his best wishes.

J. Koch contributes the principal review in this number on The latest publications of the Chaucer Society and the transmission of the Minor Poems—being Nos. LVIII, LIX, LX and LXI of series I, 1879–80. After some general remarks on the MSS., Koch takes up each of the twenty Minor Poems separately and compares the different texts with each other, giving in some cases a scheme of the genealogy of the MSS. In an appendix he classifies the MSS. according to the libraries where each is found, and gives the contents of each.

Miss L. T. Smith gives an interesting summary of the contents of Cassell's *Library of English Literature*, selected, edited, and arranged by Henry Morley, in five volumes, 1876–81. She also notices briefly E. Oswald's *Thomas Carlyle, Ein Lebensbild und Goldkörner aus seinen Werken*, and J. Darmesteter's *Macbeth*, edition classique. From her description this appears to be an excellent edition of the play, carefully annotated, and provided with a valuable introduction to the study of Shakspeare.

M. Trautmann closes this number with a very hurried notice of Storm's *Englische Philologie*, reviewed in this *JOURNAL*, II 484. He regrets that he cannot speak of it as fully as he intended and as it deserves. After some quotations from the introduction, he gives a very brief summary of the contents of each chapter, taking exception, as already mentioned, to Storm's advocacy of Bell's vowel-system, and closes his notice as follows: "Was dem buche fehlt ist ein hinlänglich ausgereifter plan und rechte ordnung

in der verteilung des stoffes: es ist oft ein allzu dünnes und zuweilen kaum zu erkennendes logisches fädchen, was die einzelnen abschnitte zusammenhält. Sieht man jedoch lediglich auf den inhalt, so kann man nicht leicht zu überschwenglich loben."

J. M. GARNETT.

HERMES. 1881.

No. I.

Th. Mommsen. Die Remuslegende (pp. 1-23). The story of Romulus and Remus as it appears in Livy was fully developed as early as 300 B. C., at which time the tradition was fixed by means of coins and works of art. The figure of Remus is of later origin and purely supplementary. Roman rites and religious ceremonies, as well as legendary topography, fail to exhibit distinct traces or mementoes of Remus.

The name Remus in all probability was merely a differentiation of Romulus. The story of the contention between the brothers seems to have arisen in Republican times, and to have been moulded after the type of the two consuls. The element of the *auspicium* in the quarrel is rather dissonant; one and the same point of observation was an essential requisite for auspices referring to the intended founding and locating of one and the same city. Besides, the auspices were never considered the proper means of deciding a question of precedence between colleagues.

The female divinity *Remurina* is probably a personification which arose from the *ager Remurinus*, a hill on the Tiber about four miles from the city. This *ager Remurinus* had no connection whatever with *Remus*. As this spot, however, was a little too far away to fit into the *auspicium* of Romulus, the position of Remus was localized opposite the *Palatinus*, viz. on the *Aventinus*. This version of the story, by the way, seems to have been invented as late as the Augustan period.

Discrepancies between the earlier and later versions in the remaining portion of the legend are glaring enough. According to one version, Remus was slain immediately after the *auspicia*; according to another, the brothers were for a time joint rulers, e. g. Verg. Aen. I 293:

—Remo cum fratre Quirinus

Iura dabunt.

Th. Mommsen. A second fragment of the Lex Rubria of the year 705 of Rome. These fragments were found on parts of a plate of bronze which fitted together, in 1880, near Este. Julius Caesar had granted Roman citizenship to the communities of Gallia Transpadana in 705 A. U. = 49 B. C. Consequently the jurisdiction of these new citizens had to be modified so as to conform to their new legal status. This was done by the *Lex Rubria*, of which the present fragment evidently is a part. The fourth table of this Lex Rubria was found many years ago at Veleia. Mommsen thinks there can be no reasonable doubt that the fragment before us must be referred to the same law.

L. Roscius Fabatus, who introduced the bill, seems to have acted in the interest or at the order of Caesar: the vote was taken only twenty days before Caesar's arrival in Rome.

Both form and subject-matter being of great interest, we subjoin the text :

[Quei post hanc legem rogatam in eorum quo oppido municipio colonia praefectura foro veico conciliabulo castello territoriove, quae in Gallia cisalpeina sunt eruntve ad I virum II virum praefectumve in iudicium fiducia aut pro socio aut] mandati aut tutelae, suo nomine quodve ipse earum rerum quid gessisse dicetur, add(u)cetur, aut quod furti, quod ad hominem liberum liberamve pertinere dicatur, aut iniuriarum* agatur: sei is, a quo petetur quomve quo agetur, d(e) e(a) r(e) in eo municipio colonia praefectura iudicio certare [volet] et si ea res (sestertium decem milium) minorisve erit, quo minus ibei d(e) e(a) r(e) iudex arbiterve addicatur detur, quove minus ibei d(e) e(a) r(e) iudicium ita feiat, utei de iis rebus, quibus ex h(ac) l(ege) iudicia data erunt, iudicium fieri exerceri oportebit, ex h(ac) l(ege) n(ihilum) r(ogatur). Quoius rei in qu(o)que municipio colonia praefectura quoiusque I vir(i) eiusve, qui ibei lege foedere pl(ebi)ve sc(ito) s(enatus)ve c(onsulto) institutove iure dicundo praefuit, ante legem seive illud pl(ebi) sc(itum) est, quod L. Roscius a. d. V eid. Mart. populum plebemve rogavit, quod privatim ambigetur, iuris dict(i)o iudicis arbitri recuperatorum datio addictio[n]e fuit] quantaeque rei pecuniaeve fuit: eius rei pequn(iaeve) quo magis privato Romae revocatio sit qu[ove mi]nus quei ibei i(ure) d(icundo) p(raerit) d(e) e(a) r(e) ius dicat iudice[m arbitrumve det,] utei ante legem sive illud pl(ebi) sc(itum) est, [quod L. Roscius a. d.] V eidus Mart. populum plebe[m]ve rogavit, ab eo quei ibei i(ure) d(icundo) p(raerit) ius di[ci] iu[dicem arbitrumve dari oportuit, ex h(ac) l(ege) n(ihilum) r(ogatur)].

F. Blass adds some supplementary notes to his discussion of the papyrus fragments recently published by him, *Hermes* XV, p. 366 sqq., which now are identified as being derived from Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens.

H. Jordan. *Quaestiones Orthographicae Latinae* IV-V. Jordan notes that *quotannis* is merely the shorthand of *quotquot annis*, as inscriptions prove. *Quot calendis* (= omnibus calendis) occurs in Plautus (*Stichus*, 60). There was probably no other cause to prevent the establishment of *quot mensibus* as a definite adverb than the phonetic consideration. But what of *quotidie*? The MSS. fluctuate between *cottidie* and *cotidie*, between *cottidianus* and *cotidianus*, whereas they never exhibit the form *quotidie*, *quotidianus*. How then were the latter (the original) forms of the word changed into those above? The metamorphosis occurred just as *cum* (conjunction) was developed from *quom*, and *cur* from *quor* (which J. derives from abl. *quōd*). *Quotidie* probably was in vogue down to the times of Cicero, although it was archaic in Quintilian's day (*Inst. Ov.* I 7, 6). What is the etymology of *classis*? Curtius and Pott derive the word from *κλῆσις*, Doric *κλᾱσις*. This derivation Jordan calls into question: he fails to see how the peculiar sense of the Roman *classis* could have been derived from *καλεῖν*. Nor does *calare* exhibit the etymology of *classis*. Jordan compares the gloss *κληδός* = *σώβος* (heap, crowd, swarm) in Hesychius, and so = *squadron*, *agmen* *clausum*, *globus*.

Carl Robert, of Berlin, presents an archaeological communication: *Der Streit der Goetter um Athen*. The author of this paper discusses the subject of a vase-painting now at St. Petersburg, and first published there by Stephani, in 1872. His view of the famous contest between Athena on the one side and

Poseidon on the other differs materially from that of the first editor as well as from that of Petersen and Brunn. Poseidon is making a motion with his trident as if to destroy the sacred olive on the Acropolis, while the sacred serpent wound around the tree poises her head against the assailant; Dionysus is hastening up to ward off the invader, and Athena is getting ready to thrust her lance against her rival. The bearded man seated near by is Cecrops; the nymph present is Pandrosos, the *genius loci*, and the small temple is the Erechtheion. The salt-spring was left as a memento of the struggle on the part of Poseidon, rather than as a gift useful to the community of Athens, and such also is the view to be taken of the olive of Athena. The people of Athens chose their tutelary deity not from utilitarian considerations, but as a matter of free choice and pure affection. This interpretation of the vase-painting—so Robert claims—agrees fully not only with the literary tradition in Herodotus, Polemio, Pausanias, Callimachus, etc., but also with the ancient representation of the same subject on the western front of the Parthenon.

E. Stutzer. *Beitraege zur Erklaerung und Kritik des Lysias*, pp. 88-121. Stutzer discusses at great length the ninth, the fourth, and the twenty-seventh speeches of Lysias. He considers the ninth a mere abstract. Great familiarity with Lysianic literature is evinced by the author in the course of his disquisitions, but the article does not admit of condensation.

A. Breysig. *Notes on Avienus*, pp. 122-136.

M. Schanz contributes a communication on the Sources of Vegetius. Vegetius was an epitomator of military science who compiled his work in the fifth century A. D., being a contemporary of Valentinian (425-455 A. D.) Schanz finds that the authorities abstracted and compiled by him were books dating from Cato down to the time of Commodus (—180 A. D.), viz. Cato, Celsus, Frontinus, Paternus.

Vegetius quotes the *Constitutiones* of Augustus Trajan and Hadrian, but not at first hand, as Schanz points out. The reference to the *Constitutio* of Hadrian is evidently drawn from Paternus. Hence Schanz identifies another passage, I 27, as derived from Paternus by Vegetius as well as some others. One of these passages—derived from Paternus according to Schanz—possesses a curious interest. It seems that the soldiers had a kind of savings-bank in each cohort, into which half the donative was put. Each cohort had its special fund, and besides these there was a common burial fund for the benefit of any comrade in the entire legion.

No. II.

W. Dittenberger, (Halle). Critical remarks on some Greek inscriptions.

A few years ago O. Riemann published a few inscriptions from Thyatira, from copies of Cyriacus of Ancona. But inasmuch as Cyriacus added the note 'ex insula Θειαρῖπα,' Dittenberger observes that probably he meant, not the Lydian town of Thyatira, but the island of Thera. The inscription referred to was read by Cyriacus some 435 years ago, and is published in C. I. G. 6819. The very form *Χαριστηῖον* which Riemann failed to discover in Stephanus, and therefore proposed to change to *Χαριστηρίον*, is found in three distinct inscriptions, one being from Thera and two from Cnidus, hence from *Doric* localities.

Another reading of a Doric inscription by Riemann is emended by Dittenberger. The services of some priest of Anaphê (near Thera) are commended in a decree: τὰν ποθεορείαν καὶ τὰν ἐπιμέλειαν ἀξίως λείτων θεῶν κατὰ πάντα καιρὸν φαίνεται ποιούμενος. This peculiar word *λείτων* Riemann explains as being = *λαίτων* (ap. Hesychium = *δημόσιος*); D. simply reads ΑΕΙ ΤΩΝ κτέ.

In another inscription Riemann's reading is ὁ ἱερεὺς τῆς ἀπωτάτης (of the most distant) Ἀρτέμιδος—after Cyriacus. D. calls attention to the ease with which Π might have been misread for ΓΙ and thus reads τῆς ἀγιοτάτης.

Another particularly interesting inscription discussed by Dittenberger is one first published by Kumanudis in the *Ἀθήναιον* VII, p. 207, n. 2. It was brought to Athens and sold to the Archaeological Society there by some dealer. It refers to the sale of sacerdotal positions, an antiquarian matter mentioned only in one passage in extant Greek literature, viz. Dionysius Halic. *Antiqq. Rom.* I 21. Kumanudis suggested Erythrae, τῆς Αἰολίδος, as the source of the inscription. Apart from the fact that Erythrae is in Ionia and not Aeolis, the dialect of the inscription would point rather to the Doric Hexapolis, or to the Megarian colonies on the sea of Marmora and of the Black Sea. Special words seem to point to the latter region and in particular to Chalkedon; this location being supported by the name of the month Διονυσίος and the verb *αἰσιμῶν* (cf. *αἰσυνήτης*, etc.) Both are found in the Chalcedonian inscription No. 3794 C. I. G. We note but one of the many interesting provisions of this decree, namely that which, according to Dittenberger's reading (p. 172, l. 15) stipulates: ἐξέστω δὲ καὶ (π)αιδὶ ὠνεῖσθαι. ἄλλῳ δὲ μηθενὶ ἐξέστω τὰν ἱερωτείαν (ἢ ἑαντ)ῶι; i. e. a father may buy (a priestly office) for his son, but nobody else may buy excepting for himself.

Another inscription commented upon is one of the Macedonian period, and of the times of the Achaean league; viz. regarding the accession of (Arcadian) Orchomenus to the Achaean league; published first by Foucart, *Revue Archéologique*, 1876, p. 96. The main point in which D. differs from the French scholar is in the date. Foucart assumes the year 129 when Orchomenus was dismissed from the Macedonian suzerainty, but Dittenberger assumes an earlier date, in the latter half of the 3d century B. C.

Important details of Greek history of this obscure period are contained in this interesting inscription.

The remaining observations of Dittenberger are of minor interest.

J. Freudenthal (Breslau) in his Notes on Proclus and the younger Olympiodorus reasserts a view of his as against Zeller, viz. that Olympiodorus in his prolegomena to Plato p. 26 reports of Proclus, that he ἐκβάλλει the Republic (τὰς Πολιτείας) of Plato as well as the Νόμοι. Zeller has explained this ἐκβάλλειν in a relative sense, viz. from the dialogues, but not from the body of Platonic works.

Of course the Prolegomena, as well as the βίος, are not the direct production of Olympiodorus, but a body of notes derived from lectures by Olympiodorus. This fact explains a number of blunders in these synopses. But Freudenthal suggests another explanation of the remarkable judgment of Proclus; he calls attention to the veritable deluge of books produced by Proclus in the course of a literary and academic career extending from his 24th to his 76th year.

Within the limits of so long a period of copious writing and lecturing, such an inconsistency may have well occurred as is implied in the statement ascribed to him above. A lively sketch of the literary and philosophical character of Proclus is given by Freudenthal on pp. 218-219.

A communication of uncommon interest is that by Jordan: Old Latin Inscription from Rome. This remarkable inscription was first published at Rome, by Dr. Dressel, in the *Annali dell' Instituto*, 1880, 158 pp., with an accurate colored representation of the earthen vessel on which it is engraved. Jordan's reading, which differs from that of the first editor, is as follows:

(I.) IOUEI SAT DEIVOS QOI MED MITAT NEITED ENDO COSMIS UIRCO SIED (intermediate space) ASTED NOISI OPE TOITESIAI PAK ARI VOIS

(II.) DUENOS MED FEC ED EN MANOM EINOM DZ E NOINE MED MAAO STATOD.

Passing by Jordan's criticism of Dressel and of Bücheler, let us consider his own views; according to which the equivalent in classic (or here = later) Latin would be about the following:

(I.) *Iovi Saturno divis qui me mittat, ne in te comis virgo sit; ast nisi Opi Toitesiae pacari vis.* Whoever sends me to Jupiter or Saturnus, let not a maiden be friendly to thee; except you are willing to make your peace with Ops Toitesia.

(II.) *Duenus me fecit in manum enim die noni me ma(n)o sistito: i. e.* Duenus made me; he shall place me at the festival of the manes on the ninth day.

The sacrifice referred to is that made to a dead one nine days after the burial. Nine days was the regular limit for the *lucus*; both Jupiter and Saturn are to receive an offering at the end of this period of nine days' special mourning.

Jordan then proceeds to discuss many points in the history of Latin etymology, e. g. the change of *s* to *r*, and expresses his conviction that in the present case the Latin of the writer was influenced by the Umbrian and other dialects.

In the syntactical portion of his paper he classes *endo* with the dissyllabic spurious prepositions *ergo*, *tenuis*, *inter*; in the present instance *endo* (Lucretius *indu*) is postpositive.

As regards date, Jordan observes that the inscription belongs to the time before the Second Punic War. Professor Bücheler, of Bonn, wrote an article on this same inscription in the *Rheinisches Museum* 36, 235 sqq.¹

Chr. Belger. A new mathematical fragment from Bobbio. This is a fragment of a mathematico-physical treatise on the construction of the burning-

¹ M. Bréal (Académie des Inscriptions, séance du 2 Mars 1882) reads:

IOVEIS AT DEIVOS QOI ME DMITAT, NEI TED ENDO, COSMISV IRCO, SIED.
Jupiter aut deus qui me admittat, ne te endo, commissi ergo, sit

AS[T] TED NOIS, IO PETO, ITES IAI PACARI VOIS.
Ast te nobis, eo penso, Autais iis, pacari velis.

DZENOS MED FEKED EN MANOM. EINOM DZENOI NE MED MALO STATOD.
Dzenos me fecit in bonum. Nunc Dzeno ne me malo sistito.

The vase is the speaker, placed by the side of a dead man. It contains offerings to the god. "Jupiter, or whoever may be the god who shall receive me, may not this man (the dead) fall into thy power for his faults. But let thyself, by virtue of this gift, be appeased by these prayers. Dzenos made me for good. Do not take me amiss for Dzeno." M. Bréal assigns the inscription to the third century B. C. A suggestion was made to read QOI MED MITAT *cui me mittat*—"Jupiter, or whoever may be the god to whom he sends me."—B. L. G.

glass (πύριον), derived from the Benedictine monastery of Bobbio and preserved in the Ambrosian library at Florence. There is a great deal of a kind of shorthand in this fragment, and many other particular modes of abbreviation, *e. g.* κυ- for κύκλος, γω- for γωνία, τμ- for τμήμα. The fragment is probably from some Byzantine textbook of the sixth century A. D.

Johannes Weber contributes a minor article on Interpolations of the Roman Fasti; from a collation of one particularly ancient MS. of Diodorus. A number of errors in the MS. used by Dindorf, as well as in the Fasti Capitolini, are shown. The magistrates referred to in the present communication are particularly the military tribunes with consular power, of the age of Camillus, 410 sqq. B. C.

H. Droysen examines the Athenian decree in honor of Zeno, *i. e.* the founder of the Stoic school, who died about 265-264 B. C. This decree is preserved in Diogenes Laertius VII 26, 16. The standard of criticism employed by Droysen is the set form of an Attic ψήφισμα of that age as expressed in the inscriptions of the same time. His result is a twofold one: 1. The general character of the document, apart from some minutiae of formulation, seems to be genuine; 2. Two distinct decrees are blended into one. The first, providing public commendation and a golden wreath, was passed of course before the death of the philosopher; the burial in the Ceramicus was decreed after his death.

E. Hübner enumerates the several parts of the armament or military garb of Roman legionaries, basing his description largely on two relief-portraits of a *centurio* and a *signifer* of the age of Nero and of Vespasian at Verona.

M. Schanz. Note on Stichometry. The specimen of line-counting which Schanz adduces is found in the Clarkian MS. of Plato, and there in the Cratylus and Symposium. By computing the intervals, Schanz has noted that the average distance of these marks is about 100 times 35 letters. Now 35 letters is the average length of an hexameter. Hence it would seem that the length of the hexameter was the unit of measurement, the distance of one hundred of these being marked off each time. The value of such marking of lines is palpable enough to guarantee the integrity of the copy both from a critical and commercial point of view.

E. G. SIHLER.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. IX, Part III.

In the first article in this part (pp. 225-244) Naber continues his *Sophoclea*. His conjectures are not always happy. For instance, on O. T. 1143,

φέρ' εἰπὲ νῦν, τότ' οἶσθα παῖδά μοι τινα
δοῦς, ὥς ἐμαντῶ θρέμμα θρεψαίμην ἐγώ;

he writes, 'in tali sententia nonne requiritur futurum θρεψοίμην? In vicinia eadem mihi suspicio nata est, vs. 1174,

Οἶδ. ἢ γὰρ δίδωσιν ἡδε σοι; Θερ. μάλιστ' ἀναξ.
Οἶδ. ὥς πρὸς τί χρείας; Θερ. ὥς ἀναλῶσαιμι νιν.

Ibi quoque ἀναλώσοιμι malo. Potuisset respondere: ὡς ἐμοῦ ἀναλώσαντος, non sane ἀναλώσαντος. Forma orationis mutata est; sed nullam causam video, cur simul cum modo tempus quoque commutetur. Recte editur Oed. Tyr. vs. 792,

ὡς μητρί μὲν χρεῖη με μιχθῆναι, γένος δ'
ἀτλητον ἀνθρώποισι δηλώσοιμι ὄραν.

ibidemque vs. 1271

αὐδῶν τοιαῦθ', ὀθούνεκ' οὐκ ὀφιοιντό νιν,
οὐθ' οὐ' ἐπασχεν οὐθ' ὀποῖ' ἔδρα κακά,
ἀλλ' ἐν σκότῳ τὸ λοιπὸν οὐς μὲν οὐκ ἔδει
ὀφιοῖσθ', οὐς δ' ἐχρηζεν οὐ γνώσοιαιτο.'

It seems very surprising that Naber should see no distinction between the nature of the last two passages and that of the former pair. In the latter the optative forms are due to the indirect mode of statement, and would be represented in direct speech by *χρή, δηλώσεις, ὕψονται, γνώσονται*. But Naber surely would not say that *θρέψομαι* or *ἀναλώσω* represents the meaning of the optative in either of the former passages. Again on O. C. 41 (*τίνων τὸ σεμνὸν ὄνομ' ἂν εὐξαίμην κλύων*;) he writes: 'Vertit Nauckius, "quarumnam sancto auditio nomine invocabo (illas)," et hoc ut probet, affert Oed. Tyr. 117: ὅτον τις ἐκμαθὼν ἐχρήσατ' ἂν. Itaque non videtur animadvertisse κλύων praesentis temporis esse et ea potestate facile ferremus aoristum ἀκούσας, sed absonum est praesens ἀκούων. Nihil aliud latet nisi: *τίνων τὸ σεμνὸν ὄνομ' ἂν εὐξαίμην λέγων*;' Naber appears here to limit unduly the functions of κλύων. Cf. Eur. Hec. 967 (*λέγουσα μύθους ὧν κλύων ἀφικόμεν*), Or. 1554, I. T. 901, &c. On the other hand, some of his proposed changes are ingenious, if not probable. For instance: on O. C. 727 (*θάρσει, παρέσται· καὶ γὰρ εἰ γέρων ἐγώ, τὸ τῆσδε χώρας οὐ γεγήρακεν σθένος*) he argues that Oedipus had not asked for the aid of the other citizens, but of the Chorus itself (v. 724 *ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐμοὶ φαίνοιτ' ἂν ἦδη τέρμα τῆς σωτηρίας*), and that the old men were not too weak to repel Creon's violence, as is shown by l. 815, 840, 857. He therefore proposes to read *χειμῶς* for *χώρας*. In El. 567, where Electra reports the cause of the anger of Artemis, she says that her father *παίζων κατ' ἄλσος ἐξεκίνησεν ποδοῖν στικτὸν κεράστην ἐλαφον*, and unfortunately vaunted his achievement. 'Primum jam satis difficile est *pede* cervum ἐκκινεῖν, sed *pedibus* quomodo id fieri possit, non video.' It appears one inferior MS. reads *ἐξεκίνησεν*. 'Non lubenter recipere solemus deteriorum Codicum lectiones: tamen verum est *ἐξεκίνησεν*. Agamemnon cervum cursu vicit.' On El. 596 he notes that *ἱεῖς, τίθεις* are the correct forms, not *ἱης, τίθης*, as Porson maintained; and quotes a large number of instances in which the MSS. present the correct spelling. But here Wecklein has already adopted them in his edition. On El. 1457 (*χαίροις ἂν, εἰ σοι χαρτὰ τυγχάνοι τάδε*) he writes: 'Si non habes dicere, quo optativus pertineat, mecum fortasse non recusabis scribere: *τυγχάνει*.' But here the indic. was proposed by Herm., and has been adopted by Wolff and Jebb. In Phil. 617 Odysseus is said to have promised, after hearing that the presence of Philoctetes was indispensable to the success of the Greeks, *τὸν ἀνδρ' Ἀχαιοῖς τόνδε δηλώσειν ἄγων· οἴοιτο μὲν μάλισθ' ἐκούσιον λαβών, εἰ μὴ θέλοι δ', ἄκουτα*. On this Naber writes: 'Ad illud *οἴοιτο* primum Nauckium audiemus: *ein dem Deutschen gebrauch entsprechender Optativ in fortgesetzter orat.*

obliqua. Deinde ut probet Graecos similiter dixisse, affert Aesch. Agam. 606 ἀπάγγελον πῶσαι ἦκειν, -γυναῖκα πιστὴν δ' ἐν δόμοις εὔροι μολῶν, sed haec dum scribebat, fortasse non potuit cognoscere Cobeti disputationem, qui luculenter evicit scribendum esse ἐνδον εὐρήσει. [This conjecture of Cobet's seems very unnecessary: εὔροι no doubt expresses an ironical wish.] 'Sed nihil opus est pluribus ostendere οἷοιτο esse corruptum, quod nihil significabit, etiamsi quis ad mirum usum optativi modi connivere velit. Emenda, nam hoc emendare appello ubi ne umbra quidem dubitationis superest, οἶδν τε μὲν μάλισθ' κτέ. Sic convenientia Graeci sermonis cum Germanorum usu tenues dilabatur in auras.'

C. M. Francken contributes the next article (pp. 245-272) on Cicero's oration *pro A. Caecina*. He thus begins: 'Quae ad causam Caecinianam pertinent nuper tam copiose quam eleganter exposita sunt a viro Consultissimo J. Kappeyne van de Coppello in libro: *over VIM FACERE in het interdictum uti possidetis. Uitgegeven door de Kon. Akad. van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Amst. 1880*. Eam disputationem non esse Latine scriptam doleo non tam nostra causa quam exterorum. Nemo enim apud nos existet, qui hoc genus orationis nitidum et fusum aspernetur: exteris autem sic aliqua difficultas obiicitur; et in perpetuo flumine librorum et libellorum, quo prela sudant et viri docti paene obruntur, ea potissimum appetuntur, quae, ceteris quidem (ut aiunt) paribus, sine putamine molesto fructum offerunt et saporem.' He therefore thinks it worth while 'quaedam ex ea commentatione delibare non iurisconsultis sed philologis. Qui si eam orationem, quoniam in iure versatur tota, iurisconsultis relinquunt ac non contra vindicant, non tantum magna se privant voluptate, sed etiam officio desunt. Est enim una ex optimis Tullianis, et ad eius ingenium et eloquentiam cognoscenda quantivis pretii.' The article is very able and interesting, but does not yield much that can be briefly extracted. On the passage in § 39 'huiusce rei vos statuētis nullam esse actionem, nullum experiundi ius constitutum, qui obstiterit armatis hominibus, qui multitudine coacta non introitu sed omnino aditu quempiam prohibuerit?' he denies that any passage of Cicero can be adduced that will justify the use of *qui* for *in eum qui*. 'Tum demum credam Latinum esse si e. g. "invehitur qui eum laesit prior" putare licebit dici pro "invehitur in eum, qui—" Quantum video, non potest locus in integrum restitui, nisi duas literas si excidisse statuamus.'

The third article (pp. 273-302) is by Naber, entitled ΤΡΙΤΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΡΧΟΜΑΙ, and contains a large number of conjectural emendations on the

¹I fear that it is useless to protest against the way in which Dutch scholars are rewriting Greek syntax. If the examples in Krüger 154 6 A. 4 and Kühner p. 593 Anm. 2, cited for the change to the optative, are not satisfactory, I am at a loss to know what will satisfy the Batavian mind. It is true that the Greek does not fall into *oratio obliqua* as readily as does the Roman, but ὑπέσχετο in the passage cited from Sophokles is introduction enough. In Lys. 13, 9 the very word οἷοιτο occurs. See Frohberger on the passage. Krüger says (l. c.) that in this continuation of the discourse ὅτι or ὥς cannot be used with the opt. The reason for this seems evident. The change of construction from the infinitive to the opt. is due to an anacoluthon of which the writer or speaker would be reminded by the ὅτι or ὥς, and the essence of the change is unconsciousness. Hence in Xen. Anab. 4, 3, 29, ὅτι is to be construed causally and not objectively—'because' not 'that.' Anthon calmly combines the two views: "'because that one would be the best man': i. e. adding that he would be, &c." Evidently puzzled by the inconsistency of K.'s note (g. v.), he compromised by taking both statements.—B. L. G.

text of the New Testament. It will perhaps be best in this case to give a considerable number of his suggestions, though room cannot be found for the reasoning by which they are supported. Matt. v. 13. *ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας μαρανθῇ* (for *μωρανθῇ*). 25. *καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθῇ* (for *βληθήσῃ*). 33. *ἐμπεδώσεις δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὀρκούς σου* (for *ἀποδώσεις*.) Matt. vii. 25. *προσέπεισαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ* (for *πρὸσέπεσαν*). Matt. xii. 41. *ἐν τῇ κρίσει κατὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης* (for *μετά*). Matt. xviii. 24. *ὀφειλέτης πολλῶν ταλάντων* (for *μυρίων*). 42. *καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ἀποδοθῆναι* (for *καὶ ἀποδοθῆναι*). Matt. xxiii. 25. *ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμονσιν ἐτι ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκрасίας* (for *ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς*). On Matt. xxvii. 17. *τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν, Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν*, he refers to a tradition reported by Origen and a schol. that Ἰησοῦς was the personal name of Barabbas: and from this he suggests doubtfully that the words in v. 20 *ἵνα αἰτήσωνται τὸν Βαραββᾶν τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν* should read *ἵνα Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσωσιν*. Mark vi. 5. *ἐθαύμασε λίαν τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν* (for *ἐθαύμασεν διὰ*). Mark vii. 4. *ῥαντισμοὺς ποτηρίων* (for *βαπτισμοὺς*). 19. *ἐκπορεύεται θύραζε πάντα τὰ βρώματα* (for *καθαρίζων*). [Naber does not seem to have thought of the construction, adopted by the late Revisers, which makes *καθαρίζων* agree with the subject of the previous *λέγει αὐτοῖς*, with the sense, 'thus making all meats clean.'] Mark x. 21. *ἠλέησεν αὐτόν* (for *ἡγάπησεν*). 30. The words *οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφούς* . . . *μετὰ διωγμῶν* are to be expunged. Luke vii. 44-46 *ὑδωρ-οὐκ ἔδωκας, φίλημα-οὐκ ἔδωκας, τὴν κεφαλὴν-οὐκ ἤλειψας*, the negatives are to be removed; on the ground that the omission of the ordinary marks of civility is incredible. 'Liberum erat Simoni Jesum non vocare, sed postquam vocavit, ut rusticitatis crimen effugeret, id omne praestare debuit quod moribus requirebatur. Ibidem liberum erat Jesu non ire ad Pharisaicum, sed statim abire debuit, postquam animadvertit sibi debita officia non praestari.—Quo diutius locum considero, eo mea ratio certior videtur.' Luke xi. 3. *τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦσιν δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον* (for *ἐπιούσων*). Acts xix. 16. *κατακυριεύσας ἄφνω ἰσχυσε κατ' αὐτῶν* (for *ἀμφοτέρων*). Acts xxii. 23. *ῥηγνύντων τὰ ἱμάτια* (for *ῥιπτούντων*). Acts xxvi. 28. *ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πέποιθας Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι* (for *πείθεις*). Acts xxvii. 38. *ἐκβαλλόμενοι τὸν ἱστὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν* (for *τὸν σῖτον*.) It is argued that v. 18 shows that everything had been thrown overboard which could be dispensed with, even *τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου*: and it must be supposed that the *τροφή* spoken of in vv. 34 and 38 was only a small portion of the cargo (probably of wheat) reserved for the food of the ship's company. 'Nimia ea fuit imprudentia eiicere quem solum habebant commeatum.—Deinde si in mare eiecissent illud omne unde victus sibi suppeteret, quantillum id erat ut navis levaretur? Verum, ut conjicio, *ἐκούφιζον τὸ πλοῖον*, non *ἐκβαλλόμενοι τὸν ΣΙΤΟΝ*, sed *τὸν ΙΣΤΟΝ*. Hoc extremum consilium perditis rebus supererat. Metuebant praeterea, uti arbitror, ne sibi accideret quod Achilles Tatius scribit naufragis accidisse, p. 91, 27; ibi enim navis *λανθάνει προσερχθεῖσα ὑφάλῳ πέτρᾳ καὶ ῥήγνυται πᾶσα*, deinde *ὁ ἱστὸς ἐπὶ θάτερα πεσὼν τὸ μὲν τι κατέκλασε, τὸ δὲ τι κατέδυσεν αὐτῆς*. Simul autem cum malo maiore, nam τὸν μέγαν ἱστὸν simpliciter ἱστὸν appellant, perierat magnum velum, quod aliquot diebus ante cum reliquis armamentis fortasse jam eiectum fuerat, unde per tot dies incerti et consilii inopes *διεφέροντο ἐν τῷ Ἀδρίᾳ*. Sed supererat *ὁ ἀκάτειος ἱστὸς*, malus minor, cui parvum velum adaptari potuit. Hinc, ut est vs. 41, *ἐπάραντες τὸν ἄρτέμωνα τῇ πνεύσῃ κατεῖχον εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν*.

Nunc demum intelligimus cur exciso et abjecto maiore malo, τοῦ ἀπρέμωτος mentio fiat.'

Cobet next has an article (pp. 303-339) containing corrections of Cornelius Nepos. Two or three specimens of his notes may be quoted. Themist. VII 5. *Apud quam iam bis classes regias fecisse naufragium.* This statement is false; since after the battle at Marathon the fleet returned safe to Asia with the prisoners from Eretria. 'Multum igitur mihi arridebat Peerlkampii emendatio qua omnis difficultas removetur: *OPES regias.* *Opes* enim et apud alios et saepe apud Nepotem dicitur de copiis tam terrestribus quam navalibus.—Quamquam autem *OPES* ab initio multum arridebat, tamen αὶ δευτεραι φροντίδες meliorem lectionem suggererunt, quam recipimus: *bis COPIAS regias fecisse naufragium.*' Them. VII 6. *Quare si suos legatos recipere vellent, quos Athenas miserant, se remitterent: aliter illos numquam in patriam essent recepturi.* The fault should be corrected by reading *ESSE REVERSUROS.* 'εὐφημία haec est, sed quid dicat satis est perspicuum. Apud Suetonium in *Caesare* cap. 13, *Caesar pontificatum maximum petens, cum mane ad Comititia descenderet praedixisse matri osculanti fertur domum se nisi Pontificem non reversurum.* Caesar, si repulsam tulisset, manus [sic] sibi consciscere decreverat. Themistocles Lacedaemoniis dixit nisi ipse remitteretur legatis eorum necem esse paratam.' On Cim. IV 3, he refers to his correction given in this Journal, Vol. II, p. 249, and adds, 'Quod Scaliger alicubi dixit *Codices esse sterquilinia* vel hic unus locus quam verum sit declarat. Pro *coquebatur* sunt qui exhibeant *QUO QUEREBATUR*: pro *invocatos CONVOCATOS*: pro *devocaret devoraret* et *devorarent*: pro *intermittebat PRAETERMITTEBAT*: pro *quotidie* *COTIDIE* et *COTIDIE*. [But see Neue, i. 676.] Quid eo homine facias qui scribat: *cottidie sic cena ei quo querebatur ut quos convocatos vidisset in foro omnes devoraret.*' On Alcibiad. V 1, *itaque tempus eius interficiendi quaerere instituerunt*, he prefers to read *institerunt*, id est *coeperunt*. He shows by a large number of examples that we should say 'iter, viam, cursum insistere, non instituere.' Caesar, he maintains, always used this form, 'sed in expellendo verbo antiquiore librariorum natio tamquam coniurasse videtur.' On *Datam.* V 2, *qua celeritate cum magnam benevolentiam regis Datames consecutus esset, non minorem invidiam aulicorum excepit*, he writes: 'non est Latinum *Datames invidiam aulicorum excepit*. Corrigendum arbitror: *non minor EUM invidia aulicorum excepit*. Idem nunc video olim Bosio placuisse: "*sic enim* (inquit) *solent Latini scriptores.*" Sed deinde nactus, ut putabat, simile exemplum apud Curtium, bonam correctionem abiecit dicens: "*excipere est suscipere.*" Cras credam.' On *Attic.* XXI 6, *quare a vobis peto PRIMUM ut consilium probetis meum*, DEINDE *ne frustra dehortando impedire conemini*, he says: *non duas res ab amicis petit sed unam. Primum et deinde eodem sensu ponuntur quo Graece μάλιστα μὲν — εἰ δὲ μή.* Sic datur optio ut quod potissimum velis addatur verbis μάλιστα μὲν (*primum*), quod cum fieri non possit verbis εἰ δὲ μή subiicitur id quo contentus sis.' [In *Hdt.* I 59 we have a similar use of πρῶτα μὲν — δεύτερα: συνεβόλενε Ἱπποκράτει πρῶτα μὲν γυναῖκα τεκνοποιὸν μὴ ἀγεσθαι ἐς τὰ οἰκία, εἰ δὲ τυγχάνει ἔχων, δεύτερα τὴν γυναῖκα ἐκπέμπειν.]

The concluding portion of the *Epistula Critica* of J. B. Kan to Cobet follows (pp. 340-354). He criticises passages in Caesar, *Bell. Gall.*, in Cicero's orations, and other Latin writers, and also in Xenophon's *Hellenica*, Demosthenes' *de Corona*, Aeschylus' *Agam.*, and Sophocles' *Oed. Tyr.*

In the last article (pp. 355-360) Cobet offers emendations for some passages in Galen and Appian. In commenting on a passage in Galen he takes occasion to correct Plat. Rep. 345 c. τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς ποιμένα — ΠΟΙΜΑΙΝΕΙΝ οἶει τὰ πρόβατα. 'Mendosum est ποιμαίνειν: requiritur enim verbum significans pastoris in curando grege studium et diligentiam. Graeculus nescio quis sensit vitium et repperit Platonis sententiam sed non Platonis manum: substituit enim παχύνειν pro ποιμαίνειν. Sed Plato scripserat ΠΙΑΙΝΕΙΝ, id est πίονα ποιεῖν, pro quo Galenus dixit κατασκευάζουσιν αὐτὰ πίονα.' He says that after writing this he looked into Bekker's *Commentarius Criticus*, and found that the Paris MS. A, the best of all, had πιαίνειν, which Stallbaum had neglected to note.

He quotes a passage from Galen, viii, p. 190, illustrating Dem. 54, 9 (Conon) Θεώμενος δὲ τις ἄλλος ἀλεκτρυόνας ἔδοντας, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνοι τὰς πτέρυγας προσέκρουον πρὸ φθῆς, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς τοὺς βραχίονας προσκρούων ταῖς πλευραῖς ἐμμεῖτο τὴν φωνὴν τῶν ζώων. And another merely for its curiosity: Φόβος δ' ἦν ἄλλω μήπως ὁ βασιτάζων τὸν κόσμον Ἀτλας ἀποσείσῃται κεκμηκὼς αὐτὸν οὕτως τε καὶ αὐτὸς συντριβείη καὶ ἡμᾶς αὐτῷ συναπολέσειεν.

C. D. MORRIS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE. Vol. VI.

No. I.

I. Pp. 1-21. In his studies on Demosthenes (II), H. Weil discusses the authenticity of the first oration against Aristogeiton. (This précis gives an outline of the *method* rather than of the substance.) I. First, the author states the views of scholars, ancient and modern. Among the former, Dionysius Hal. and a few others held that the oration was unworthy of Demosthenes, whilst Plutarch and nearly all others regarded it as genuine. Of the moderns, since Casaubon, hardly any except Ruhnken agree with Hemsterhuys and Valkenaer in regarding it as a work of the great orator. The author, without first setting forth his views, gives the general presumptions against the authenticity. II. He then propounds the question: Is the oration *authentic*?—that is, a real speech, made on some occasion by some orator, whether D. or not, against a defendant named Aristogeiton; or is it a mere essay, written for an imaginary process, and attributed to D.? He here discusses the special arguments against authenticity (in the sense defined above) with such impartiality that we can only gather gradually which side he advocates; and in the discussion he produces strong arguments in favor of authenticity. III. He then takes up the question: Who was the orator? and shows that the oration of Hypereides πρὸς Ἀριστογείτονα should never have been identified (as has been done) with this oration κατὰ Ἀριστογείτονος, the former being a *defence*, the latter a *prosecution*. He shows further that the style is not that of H., and points out strong resemblances between this oration and some genuine orations of D., especially the *perorations*. But this entire speech is of the nature of a peroration; in other words it is an *ἀνέησις* following the speech of Lykourgos. He then gives a number of details showing that there is no sufficient reason for doubting that the author was Demosthenes himself. The political and judicial affairs at Athens from the battle of Chaironeia to the death of Demosthenes (the speech

can be shown to have been delivered not long before his death) were of such a character as tended to produce the modifications which are visible when we compare this oration with the *De Corona*. In fact the *In Midiam* exhibits an intermediate state, bearing about the same stylistic relation to the *De Corona* that our oration does to the *In Midiam*. The rhythmic and euphonic laws (relating to succession of short syllables and to hiatus) are the same as in the unquestioned works of D.¹

2. P. 21. In Quintil. VIII 3, 26, L. Havet divides *dicendi uersum ei* so as to secure *diuersum ei*, but attempts no further emendation.

3. Pp. 22-27. And now the Fut. Indic. with *äv* is no more. In an article entitled *De futuro iuncto cum particula condicionali apud Homerum*, H. van Herwerden, stating at the outset that scarcely any scholars now-a-days defend this construction in other authors, proceeds to remove the examples from Homer. He divides the discussion into six sections: I. Examples with *äv*, in which the verb is really in the *subjunctive with a short vowel*, as in B 488: οὐκ *äv* ἐγὼ μὲν θήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω. Six indisputable instances are cited, and a seventh (I 167: τοὺς *äv* ἐγὼν ἐπιόψομαι) is shown to belong here. II. Similar examples with *κε(ν)*,—more than thirty in number. III. Examples where there is MS. authority for the absence of *äv* (*κε*), or for the subj., as Z 260, καὶ τὸς for κ' αὐτὸς. Eight or nine instances. A 139: ὁ δὲ *κεν* κεχολώσεται was pronounced spurious even by Alexandrian critics. IV. Examples where it is a question of interpretation of early copies, as A 174: οἱ *κέ* με τιμήσουσι, i. e. ΤΙΜΗΣΟΣΙ=τιμήσωσι as well. Eight instances. V. "Emendations" by means of slight changes, as A 523: ἐμοὶ δὲ *κε* ταῦτα μελήσεται: read δέ γε. Five or six examples. VI. Only two examples remain. 1. Θ 404-5, repeated 417-18. These verses can well be spared at either place, and contain two impossibilities: first, ἐς δέκατους, instead of ἐς δέκα . . . ἐνιαυτοῖς or ἐς δέκατον . . . ἐνιαυτόν, and secondly, the "vim et usum verbi μάρπτειν inauditum." 2. Δ 176: καὶ *κέ* τις ὦδ' (ὥς because of following *F*) ἐρέει,—an expression which occurs only here, whereas the idea is expressed elsewhere by a fixed formula, καὶ ποτέ τις εἶπη(σι), which occurs several times, or ὦδε δὲ τις ἐρέει which occurs, indeed, only once, but ὦδε τις εἶπεν repeated. Besides, "pro spurio habet Nitzschius." Hence this, being the only example about which there can be any reasonable doubt, cannot be regarded as establishing the construction. [Though comments are out of place here, I venture a remark or two. If I did not almost distrust my own judgment when it is favorable to an "emendation" of Herwerden's, I should regard the case as pretty well made out. But inasmuch as Herwerden thinks that Θ 404-5 was interpolated by a "poetastro non satis callente epicum sermonem ante tempora Alexandrina," may it not be that others, influenced by the misunderstood Homeric examples, admitted the construction, and that too even in prose? If so, it became Greek. Besides the few examples of the Fut. Opt. with *äv*=Fut. Indic. with *äv* in indirect dis-

¹ In a paper on the articular infinitive published in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1878 I gave the general result of my examination of the usage of the orators in this regard. The statistics there presented brought out very clearly Demosthenes' notorious fondness for the construction. Deinarchus comes nearest to him, but only to his lower level,—that of the private speeches. I have never published the detailed work, and in view of M. Weil's discussion it may be worth while to note that the average of articular infinitives in the speech against Aristogeiton is nearly the same as that in the speech against Meidias.—B. L. G.

course are also involved. Herwerden, however, assumes that there are no defensible instances of the Fut. with *äv* outside of Homer, and I suppose he includes the Opt. This theory, if accepted, with the recent explosion of the *ν ἐφελκυστικόν* doctrine, will lead to material modifications of our grammars.]

4. Pp. 28-36. The *Carmen Paschale* and the *Opus Paschale* of Sedulius. (Gaston Boissier). The Christian poet Sedulius wrote the *Carmen Paschale* (recounting in heroic verse the miracles of the Old and the New Testaments) between A. D. 424 and 450, dedicating it to the priest Macedonius, who, fearing that the exigencies of verse might have forced the author to depart from the strict line of orthodoxy, induced him to write a prose paraphrase to accompany the poem; hence the *Opus Paschale*. We are thus enabled to compare the language of prose with that of poetry during that period. I. The poetry of S. is much simpler and clearer,—in fact, from our standpoint, more prosaic, than his prose. This is due in part, no doubt, to the fact that he first wrote the poetry, and then had to seek new modes of expression for his prose paraphrase. But this does not explain all the differences; and we may by this work judge the prose of the period, except such as was written in imitation of Cicero. To judge, then, by the works of S., the language of prose was much less simple, less correct and more corrupt, than that of poetry. Words from the vulgar dialect had crept in, with the meanings which they now have in the romance languages, as *populatio* = population, perhaps even *causa* = thing (*cosa*, *chose*). Also constructions, as *de aqua baptizatus, similitudinem de juvenco*. Especially striking is “*curavit ut vacuasset*” for “*ut vacuaret*.” [This shows the origin of the French imperf. subj. Comp. Amer. Jour. of Philol., Vol. I, p. 410 ff.] Many words had experienced a change of meaning, or were used with vagueness; and there seems to have been an aversion to saying anything in simple, direct language. Compare the following passages relating to the slaughter of the innocents. The *Carmen* says simply:

Haec laceros crines nudato vertice rupit,
Illa genas secuit;

whilst the *Opus* puts it thus: “*Haec effusam vultibus comam miseranda dilacerans crinalis damni foeditate nudum verticem sauciabat; illa madidas lacrimosis imbribus genas unguium protervitate sulcabat.*” II. Hence we see that two distinct languages were used, one for prose, the other for poetry; and however strange the fact may seem to us, the language of prose no doubt seemed natural, and that of poetry forced and obscure to the majority of the people. But the corruption was due not only to the influence of the *sermo popularis* which existed already in classic times, but to a certain strained effort to speak with elegance—to a disinclination to express thoughts directly and simply; in short, to an aesthetic movement in the lettered world.

5. Pp. 37-51. Variants of a Strasburg MS. containing, among other things, the Harmonic Elements of Aristoxenos. (C. E. Ruelle). The author collated a part of this MS. a very short time before it perished along with the library, when the Protestant seminary was destroyed by the artillery of Baden in 1870. This article is of great importance for students of Aristoxenos, especially as the MS. in question no longer exists.

6. P. 51. Note on Paulini Carmen ad Nicetam, v. 292, by Chatelain, showing that for *labis unquam* we must read *nulla labes*.

7. Pp. 52-72. Critical Remarks on the Menippeae of Varro. (L. Havet.) This article is divided into six sections. It is impossible to give in a brief compass more than a most meagre table of the contents. I. The titles and sub-titles of *Menippeae*. Thirty works have these double titles, the one in Latin, the other (sub-title) in Greek (*περί* with a noun), as *Testamentum*, *περί διαθηκῶν*. The titles of both kinds were probably prefixed by Varro himself, the Latin at the time the works were composed, the Greek at a later day when the young humorist had become the old philologist. II. The *Eumenides*. Outline of contents. Discussion of five fragments, with emendations. III. *Testamentum*. Fragment emended. IV. *Sesqueulixes*. Five fragments discussed. V. *Ταφὴ Μενίππου*. General investigation. Two fragments discussed. VI. *Parmeno*. This *Menippea* is made up of very unlike portions, which the author sorts. 1. Two fragments in acatalectic cretics emended. 2. A fragment in catalectic cretics emended. 3. Five paeonian fragments discussed.

8. Pp. 72-75. Grammatical Notes (continued), by O. Riemann. (a) The impersonal passive in Greek. A few exceptions to Krüger's rule pointed out, where the tense is a perfect, as *ἐμοὶ βεβοήθηται τῷ νόμῳ*. One example where the tense is not perf.: Thuc. I 73, 2. (b) Objective genitive of personal pronouns in Greek. As to the second person, the truth lies between Krüger (47, 7, A 8) and Kühner (II, 454, 3, A 11). Cf. Soph. Elect. 1036. (c) *λέγω*, *δείκνυμι*, etc., *ὥς*. Criticism of Madvig's rules. Examples cited where *ὥς* does not imply any doubt on the part of the narrator. It is used even after verbs of *knowing*, *learning*, *showing*. (d) The author corrects a mistake which he made, Rev. de Phil. V, p. 166, l. 21-22.

9. Pp. 76-103. Unpublished scholia of Juvenal. (C. Beldame.) The municipal library of Nice owns a MS. of the 12th century containing the Satires of Juvenal and Persius, with numerous notes on the margin and between the lines, by far the greater part being of earlier origin than the MS., and having been copied by the same hand as the MS. That the copyist is not the author of the notes is shown by instances where he wrote the wrong word in the text, but copied the explanation correctly, as:

-1- testiculos

"More supervacuum cultris abrumperе carmen,"

in which he mistook *carnem* for *carmen*. Several instances of this are found. The age of the author cannot be fixed with precision. He alludes to the old church of St. Peter, built in 326. He seems to have been well read in Greek and Latin, and refers to a work of his own on orthography. He invokes the authority of Homer, Sophokles, Plato, Plutarch. He refers to many Latin authors (from Varro to Priscian), sometimes quoting their exact words. Among these quotations are seven from Festus "de verborum significatione," but they are very much like the corresponding passages in the abridgment of Paulus Diac. The scholia are generally explanatory, but sometimes they are critical—a rare thing in those days. Beldame gives the scholia to the first six satires, amounting to 24 pages.

10. P. 103. L. Havet calls attention to Cic. de Off. III 3, 15, as cited by Nonius (Quicherat, p. 488 M, 20), showing that Nonius has preserved the true reading, "quod *idem*."

11. CHARLES GRAUX. A biographical sketch by E. Chatelain. The career of this wonderful genius demands some space. Charles Graux was born at Vervins (Aisne), Nov. 23, 1852, and died at Paris, Jan. 13, 1882. At the college of Vervins he omitted two years (the sixth and the fourth classes) by extraordinary promotion, and yet carried away all prizes throughout his course. In 1868 he went to Paris and received the degrees of *Bachelier des Sciences* and *Bachelier des Lettres*. In 1871 he entered the *École des Hautes Études* as a pupil, and studied palaeography under Tournier; and in 1872 was admitted as *Licencié des Lettres*, his Greek thesis attaining the highest grade. From this time on he had access to the Greek MSS. of the National Library, and Greek Palaeography became his vocation. Prosecuting his studies further, in 1873 he was considered by Tournier competent to direct palaeographic discussions in his stead. The 10th vol. of the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* contains his first works. In October, 1874, he became "*répétiteur de philologie et d'antiquités grecques*," which place he held for seven years, being made "*maître de conférences*" in 1881. During the summer vacation of 1875 he visited 60 libraries in Spain and examined 450 MSS. The general results of this mission are summed up in the *Archives des missions*, 3d series, Vol. I, pp. 111-163. During the vacation of 1876 he executed a similar mission to Denmark and Sweden, the immediate result of which was an article of 104 pages in the *Arch. des Miss.* VI 2, in which he described 100 MSS. of the Royal Library of Copenhagen, with an appendix describing 30 MSS. belonging to the university of that city.

On his return he was made assistant librarian of the *Bibliothèque de l'Université*. In 1881 he became librarian. Here his services were invaluable, and the library was greatly improved. His faculty for organisation had already been displayed when he was a pupil of the *École des Hautes Études*, at which time a society was formed among the members of the *conférences*, where his services were so indispensable that when he was forced to withdraw by pressure of labor, the society soon ceased to exist.

In 1877 Tournier revived the *Revue de Philologie* (founded by L. Renier in 1845, but soon discontinued), and L. Havet undertook the Latin department. They conceived the idea of annexing to their periodical a *Revue des Revues*, in which should be published *résumés* of all articles of scientific value relating to classical philology that were to be found in journals of a high grade in any part of the world, amounting annually to about 80,000 pages to be epitomized. There seemed to be but one man capable of organizing the work, and that man was Charles Graux, then twenty-four years of age. He had to prepare a list of the journals to be reviewed, find co-laborers at home and "general editors" in foreign countries competent to review and to select assistants, and (what was probably the most difficult task of all) he had to see that the work was done in time and done properly. It may be added that he had to examine all the manuscript reports and prepare them for the press, correcting the style, abbreviating, etc.; and this he did with such care that a misspelled name, even of a foreigner, rarely escaped his eye. For the first volume he himself epito-

mized 45 volumes of reviews. He was at the same time secretary of the *Revue de Philologie*, corresponded with contributors, and corrected proofs. Besides, he contributed many valuable articles of his own, including critical editions of several works that had never before been published. These articles amounted to more than 300 pages in five years.

In the vacation of 1879 he again visited Spain to collate and photograph various MSS., and in the Easter holidays (1880) he went once more to that country to complete his task. Some of the results he embodied in his Doctor Dissertation: "*Étude sur les origines du fonds grec de l'Escorial*," a work of 662 pages.

In 1879 he resigned the chief editorship of the *Revue des Revues* and undertook the classical department of the *Revue Critique*, to which he had already contributed several important articles, and here again his services were of the highest value. Up to his death he had himself contributed 60 valuable articles to this review.

Having received the degree of *Docteur ès Lettres* (Jan. 11, 1881), he was made *maître de conférences à la Faculté des Lettres*, and held two conferences (something like the German seminaries) per week, but still continued his duties at the *École des Hautes Études* and at the library.

In August, 1881, he went to Italy and searched the libraries of Venice, Milan, Florence, Rome, extending his excursion to Naples, Pompeii, Paestum. He found many uncollated MSS., and many more which had been used to little advantage. He collected material for a new article on Stichometry, a subject to which he had already made a very important contribution. His leave of absence was extended that he might comply with a request to examine and classify the 451 Greek MSS. (Palatine) of the Vatican, of which they were preparing a catalogue; and he worked at this task with a feverish ardor which may have contributed to his fatal malady. He returned Dec. 23 to Paris, assisted at a doctor examination the 26th, went home to visit his relatives, returned the 31st, and on the 6th of January, 1882, he was prevented from resuming his university labors by an indisposition which rapidly developed into a malarial fever against which all the resources of science were unavailing. On the 13th he passed away at the age of twenty-nine.

In addition to the works already mentioned, Graux had published an edition of the *Oeconomicus* of Xenophon, and of Plutarch's *Life of Demosthenes*, to which he was soon to add the *Life of Cicero*. He had also contributed two articles to Saglio's *Classical Dictionary*, and had published a treatise of 33 pages on the fortifications of Carthage at the time of the third Punic war. He had undertaken a large edition of Xenophon, and had many other works nearly or quite ready for the press. [It should be remembered that Graux did no rehashing; he went to the very foundation of things, and made valuable contributions to every subject he touched.] He intended to publish a general treatise on Greek Palaeography, a subject which he had declared and shown to be in its infancy. Posthumous works will appear in the course of time.

From 1877 he was an officer of the Academy, and in 1879 was made a member of the commission for examining classic text-books for schools and colleges.

Graux was affable and obliging, and was often consulted by scholars of foreign lands as to the MSS. in France, Spain, and Denmark. In this way he became the virtual author of many anonymous works.

A volume of miscellaneous philological articles, contributed by his friends in every part of the world, is soon to be published and dedicated to the memory of Charles Graux.

12. The last page of this number begins with these impressive words: Au moment où la première livraison de notre *Revue* allait paraître, nous avons été cruellement frappés. Les obsèques de Charles Graux n'étaient pas encore terminées que nous avions la douleur de perdre un collaborateur, notre ancien maître, dont les conseils éclairés et la direction amicale étaient pour nous d'un prix inappréciable. Charles THUROT est mort subitement le 17 Janvier, 1882, dans sa cinquante-neuvième année." Thurot had taken the place of Tournier as one of the editors. The next number will contain a detailed notice of him, which will be reported for this Journal.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

ROMANIA.¹

No. 36.

Inventaire des Manuscrits en Langue Française possédés par Francesco Gonzaga I, Capitaine de Mantoue, mort en 1407. By Braghirolli, Meyer and Paris. At the end of the XIVth century the illustrious family of the Gonzagas of Mantua had gathered around them a fine collection of works of art and books, as is shown by numerous inventories still extant. One of the most important of these inventories is that made by the trustees at the death of Francesco Gonzaga in 1407, "poichè in esso, insieme con molte altre cose di pregio, sono descritti i codici latini, italiani e francesi, che costituirono la biblioteca di quel principe." This library consisted of about 400 volumes in manuscript. These books and others of the Gonzagas were sold at Venice in 1708 at the death of the Duke of Mantua, Ferdinand-Charles IV. A great number of them was purchased by J.-B. Recanatì (†1734), who left by will his manuscripts, to the number of 200, to the republic of Venice. Others became a part of the Abbé Canonici's collection, which was acquired by the Bodleian Library in 1817. It is thus that the only complete MS. of the great epic of the south of France, *Girart de Roussillon*, is now at Oxford. The list here published of the French and Provençal MSS. of the Gonzaga collection is the fellow to that of the MSS. owned by the Este family, which was published by Rajna in Romania II, p. 49. Both show the great esteem in which French literature was held at Mantua and Ferrara in the XIVth century. The list numbers 67.

Sur un épisode d'Aimeri de Narbonne. By G. Paris. In the song of Aimeri de Narbonne there is a famous episode, which relates that Aimeri, wishing to marry, sent some of his knights to ask the hand of Hermenjart, daughter of Désier, king of the Lombards. Arrived at Pavia, the king invites them to eat at his table, but they refuse, saying they are rich enough to pay their own way. The king then issues an order to the townspeople to charge the strangers exorbitant prices for everything. This does not prevent them from buying a

¹ See Amer. Jour. of Phil., Vol. II, p. 261.

large quantity of provisions, whereupon the king utters another order that no wood shall be sold them at any price. The Frenchmen, however, are equal to the emergency and buy up all the nuts and wooden vessels (*noix et hanaps de madre*) which are brought them. Using these as fuel they serve a splendid repast and invite all to partake who wish. Then admitted to the palace, for want of seats they fold up their rich cloaks and sit upon them. On departing they leave their cloaks in the hall; and when the king sends messengers to tell them they had forgotten their cloaks, they return the answer that they are not in the habit of carrying their seats about with them.—This passage of the *Aimeri Fauriel* cites in proof of his theory of the southern (*méridionale*) origin of the *chansons de geste* in general and of *Aimeri de Narbonne* in particular. "Ces luttes de fierté," he says, "d'orgueil et d'ostentation de magnificence" were characteristic of Provençal manners. This same episode was invoked by the eminent historian, Dozy of Leyden, to show the Norman origin not only of *Aimeri* but also of the Narbonne cycle in general. Léon Gautier opposes Dozy in his "Épopées françaises" (vol. III, 216). Gaston Paris examines very thoroughly, in the present article, all the evidence, and concludes that there is nothing to justify Fauriel's conclusion; that Dozy's would be much more probable; but he himself is of the opinion that the story of *Aimeri* is neither French nor Provençal, but borrowed by them from some of their adjacent neighbors. The remarkable statement, *Les Normands, en fait d'épopée n'ont rien créé, mais ils ont facilement accueilli ce qu'avaient créé leurs voisins du sud et de l'est*, surely calls for something more than the mere assertion.

Un mariage dans le Haut-Forez. By Victor Smith. This is a lively and entertaining account of the marriage ceremonies which obtain in the neighborhood of Velay and Vivarais, together with the songs and metrical formulas used on such occasions. These songs, though violating the laws of French versification in nearly every line, though lacking the sanction of a more refined state of society, breathe a freshness and melody which we seek in vain in much of the stilted twaddle that we are asked to admire as poetry in contemporary French literature. The article can not be summarized.

Mélanges. Ulrich proposes *de-ex-ripare* as derivation of *desver*, and Joret, *pultus, pultura* for *poutare*. J. Cornu gives a collection of examples from the *Demanda do Santa Graal* and other sources, to show that the Portuguese particle *er, ar*, regarded by Diez as identical with Provençal *ar, er* (from *ora*), is the Latin prefix *re* become separated.

Comptes-rendus. An exhaustive criticism is given by G. Paris of Hugo Andresen's edition of Wace's *Roman de Rou et des ducs de Normandie*. Much praise is bestowed upon Andresen's work, only his critical method is pronounced "l'idéal de la confusion."

The *Périodiques* and *Chronique* complete the 9th volume of the *Romania*.

Nos. 37 and 38.

Una versione in ottava rima del libro dei *Sette Savi*. Pio Rajna published the first notice of this important MS. in *Romania* VII, 23-51, where he seeks to establish its outward history, or in other words, the general group of versions to which it belongs and its geographical position. In the first place it forms the middle part of a codex containing two other

episodes (*Appolonio di Tiro et Puzella Gaia*), covers 124 folios, and is composed of 23 *canti*. These are distributed into 706 stanzas, all of which are in the regular *ottava rima*. The date of composition is put down for about the middle of the XVth century (1420-1470 are assigned as limits), and until recently belonged to the Seibante library of Verona. The title given it in the collection just named is *Storia di Stefano*, though the contents show that it belongs to the cyclus of the Septem Sapientes, with reference to which Italy alone seemed to form an exception to other European countries, in that she possessed no rimed version of this story. France, Spain, Germany and England each had one, but up to the discovery of this document only prose versions were known to belong to the Peninsula.

We have to do here with a copy made in the Eastern Venetian Dialect territory. The rimer himself is a Venetian, and gives us all the *idiomatic* peculiarities, whether phonetic, morphological or lexicographical, of his native dialect. Alongside of these, however, Rajna finds numerous Tuscan forms, and, after a careful comparison of the Tuscan and Venetian dialect elements, comes to the conclusion that the author wished to write in Italian proper, but, with his imperfect knowledge of it, constantly fell back into his old dialect usages. This peculiar language mixture (*tosco-dialettale*) sprang up in North Italy in the second half of the XIIIth century, and became very popular with the patriotic literati in opposition to those who used the *Franco-dialettale* species, *i. e.* a mixture of langue d'oïl with the special Italian dialect.

In his second article (Romania VII, 369-406) Mr. R. attempts to show us the inner history of the MS., *i. e.* its relation to the different members of the Italian groups. Accepting Mussafia's terminology (*versio Italica*) for this set, he finds that to the five prose versions which originally composed it, this *versione rimata* must be added. Two of these five (designated by the letters *m, c*) are simple translations of the Latin (marked *l*), but the relation of *r* (*rimate*) to *l* is more difficult to determine.

Two hypotheses are suggested with reference to them: (1) *l, r*, both come independently from the same stock; (2) *r* came from *l*, but was corrupted by the aid of another outside version.

Of these suppositions R. thinks that, though the first is the simpler, it is more difficult to establish than the second. In no possible case can the direct sources of *r* be found in *l*, and between them we must always suppose some popular manipulation of the subject (*volgarizzamento*). But which, now, shall this be, *m* or *c*? Not *m*, because of the great discrepancies between it and the others, both in age and in the presentation of the subject-matter. With reference to *c*, as the intercalated member, numerous arguments are cited for and against it, and the question is left unsettled in the hope that future discovery of some MS. may throw new light upon it.

So far as the genealogy of the *versio Italica* is concerned, it is suggested that possibly it may be a sort of middle term between the European groups on the one hand and the Oriental on the other. This is rendered likely from the intimate relations which Venice held at this time with Constantinople and the East generally.

Of the different members of the *versio Italica*, *m* is Venetian, *r* do., *l* belongs to the region of the Po, *c* was produced by a Tuscan residing also in this region,

while *em es* (the remaining members of the group) are due to Venetian and Lombard authors.

At the close of this paper R. discusses the relations of the various European centres of this episode, and observes that in the Italian group we have a new case of a literary fact which up to this time has been observed only in chivalric subject-matter, viz. just as the *chanson de geste* produced in the region of the Po new families entirely distinct from the corresponding development on the other side of the Alps, so with the episode of the *sette savi*, which is not perpetuated by simple reproduction, but gives rise here to a new species.

Phonétique française. By G. Paris. For several years scholars have been expressing their dissatisfaction at Diez's treatment of the Romanic vowel system. Much that the master wrote was necessarily tentative, and will not now stand the test of criticism. With the exception of Boehmer's article on the vowel *o/u* (Rom. Stud. III, 597-602), the discontent has been expressed in hints and allusions rather than systematic criticism. Mr. Paris, taking Diez as a starting point, proposes to give a thorough revision of the French vowels, confining himself in the present article to the narrow *o* (*o fermé*). Rejecting Diez's division of 1st tonics and atonics, and 2d tonics long, short and in position, he speaks of 1st, *voyelles toniques ou atones*; 2d, of *voyelles libres ou entravées*. By *voyelle libre* he means when it is final, followed by a vowel, by a single consonant, or the groups *pr, br, tr, dr*; a *voyelle entravée* is followed by two consonants other than those mentioned. Special cases are made of *cr, gr, pl, bl*, and where *j* (yot) is combined with a consonant. Translating *libre* by *free*, and *entravée* by *bound*, his division of the vowels would be:

1st. Tonics	{	short	{ free.	2d. Atonics	{	short	{ free.
			bound.				bound.
	{	long	{ free.		{	long	{ free.
			bound.				bound.

He formulates thus the rule for the Romanic narrow *o* (=Latin *ō* and *ū*): 1st, *o* tonic free, whether it comes from classic *ō* or *ū*, becomes in French *eu*; ex. *fleur, gueule*; 2d, *o* tonic bound gives *ou*; ex. *tour, goutte*. He then proceeds to discuss these two classes in detail.

La Chirurgie de Roger de Parme en vers Provençaux. By Antoine Thomas. This is a notice and discussion of a MS. of the Library of Bologna, containing a metrical translation of the *Practica Chirurgica* of Roger of Parma. The author thinks that the publication of this medical treatise must be put considerably earlier than the usually accepted date, 1230. In 1859 Puccinotti, in his *Storia della Medicina*, proposed 1180; Thomas thinks this is not too early, as he shows that the Provençal version was made between 1168 and 1209, probably about 1200. A contemporary of Roger, Raymond Amiller, himself a physician, executed the translation. The translator adds a preamble of his own, with comments of the text. He confines himself likewise to the first three books of the *Practica*, omitting the fourth. Some extracts from the poem are given.

Études sur le Poème du Cid. By J. Cornu. These studies are mostly etymological, and are not of a sufficiently general interest to call for reproduction here.

Contribuições para um Romanceiro e Cancioneiro popular Portuguez. By Z. Consiglieri Pedroso. The Portuguese, like many others of the European nations, have not been slow to appreciate the value of their popular songs and traditions; and while they have no folk-lore society, as far as I know, there have not been wanting vigorous workers in this most interesting field. Among the most ardent of these are Adolpho Coelho, *Romances populares e rimas infantis portuguezas* (Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil. III, and Romania III 263), and Pedroso, who has already published six numbers of a work entitled *Contribuições para uma mythologia popular portugueza*. His present article is a short exposé of his studies in folk-lore, of which he makes three great divisions (tres grandes capitulos). Of these he speaks as follows: O primeiro occupa-se especialmente do maravilhoso popular, dos restos e vestígios da mythologia do povo que ainda se conservam na tradição oral, das superstições, crenças, prejuizos, etc., que a esse maravilhoso se referem. O segundo trata dos contos populares. O terceiro, que começamos com a presente publicação, refere-se aos romances, aos cantos, orações, jogos infantis, etc., aos elementos enfim, que devem constituir o nosso romanceiro e cancionero popular. He gives twelve or fifteen pages of specimens from his collection, which is extensive and has been made by himself, wife and mother, assisted by Senhora D. Elvira de Macedo Damasio.

Contes populaires lorrains recueillis dans un village du Barrois à Montiers-sur-Saulx (Meuse). By Emmanuel Cosquin. Continued from Romania No. XXXV. (See Am. Jour. of Phil., Vol. I, p. 507).

Chants populaires du Velay et du Forez. By Victor Smith. The reader will find here fifteen "complaintes criminelles," which tell of divers crimes. Some of these crimes, on account of their naïve cruelty and the marvellous attaching to them, have a legendary character; others again represent more real circumstances, and seem to point to determinate facts, which must have made a profound and durable impression upon the popular mind.

The *Mélanges* contains among other things: A Letter from A. d'Ancona to G. Paris on the Wandering Jew in Italy in the XIIIth Century; De l'influence régressive de l' *f* atone sur les voyelles toniques (see Romania VII, 360), by J. Cornu; Une épître française de Saint Etienne copiée en languedoc au XIII siècle, ed. by G. Paris; Mélanges catalans: I, Plainte de la Vierge; II, Du MS. Douce 162 et de la prédiction de Vincent de Ferrer en France, by P. Meyer; Deux manuscrits de Gonzague, and Sur un prétendu fragment inédit de Desclot, by Alfred Morel-Fatio; Notes sur la langue des *Farsas y églogas* de Lucas Fernandez; A stanza from a *ronde bretonne* (Le Prisonnier de Rennes), here given, will show that the expression "hoop la," so frequently heard on our streets, was not imported from the Celestial Empire, as is generally supposed. It is:

Dans la ville de Rennes,
Houpp' la la la, houpp' la,
Dans la ville de Rennes
Il ya-t'un prisonnier.

Jacob Stürzinger proposes a long list of corrections to the Sacrifice d'Abraham, ed. by Ulrich in Romania VIII, 374.

Comptes-rendus. The following important publications are noticed: *Untersuchung über die Chronique ascendante und ihren verfasser*, H. Hormel, Marburg, 1880; *Betontes ē + i und ö + i in der normannischen Mundart*, P. Schulzke, Halle, 1879; *Guilhem Figueira, ein provenzalischer Troubadour*, Emil Levy, Berlin, 1880; *Leben und Werke des Troubadours Ponz de Capduoill*, Max von Napolski, Halle, 1880; *La légende d'Œdipe, étudiée dans l'antiquité, au moyen âge et dans les temps modernes, en particulier dans le Roman de Thèbes, texte français du XII siècle*, par L. Constans, Paris, 1880; *Recull de eximplis e miracles, gestes e faules e altres legendes ordenades per A. B. C., tretes de un manuscrit en pergami del començament del segle XV, ara per primera volta estampades* (Barcelona, 1881); *Nouveau recueil de farces française des XV et XVI siècles*, par Emile Picot et Christophe Nyrop, Paris, 1880; *Faune populaire de la France*, par Eugène Rolland, 3 vols.—Vol. I, *Les mammifères sauvages, noms vulgaires, dictons, proverbes, légendes, contes et superstitions*; II, *Les oiseaux sauvages*; III, *Les reptiles, les poissons, les mollusques, les crustacés, et les insectes*—Paris, 1877-81. There will be two more volumes of this great and important work, which will be devoted to domestic animals.

The *Chronique* gives a short notice of the death of Gaston Paris's father, Paulin Paris, which took place at Paris, February 13, 1881. The deceased has been a recognized authority for the last fifty years in the literature (especially French) of the Middle Ages. A review of his life and work is promised for a future number of the *Romania*.

The premature death of the young Romanic scholar, Henry Nicol, is likewise chronicled, a much finer appreciation being shown of the value of his work than any accorded him by his countrymen at the time of his decease (January 30, 1881). He was but thirty-six years old when he died, and the talent displayed in the work he had already done caused great expectations to be entertained of him. His death leaves England without a representative of Romance philology.

SAMUEL GARNER.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A. H. SAYCE ON THE LANGUAGE OF HOMER.

Sir: I have been waiting in vain for some one to expose, as they deserve, the errors in regard to *fact* in Sayce's Appendix on the language of Homer, published in Mahaffy's History of Greek Literature. Neither G. Hinrichs (in the Deutsche Literaturzeitung, No. 20, 1881, and the Zeitschrift für Oesterreichische Gymnasien, 1881, p. 423) nor D. B. Monro (in the Cambridge Journal of Philology, No. 18, 1880), both of whom have dealt the essay some hard blows, has done justice to this point, though the latter has noticed a number of inaccuracies not included in the list below. If I may trust my Seber, my Dunbar, etc., there are the following actual mistakes, which can hardly be misprints, in Sayce's statements.

P. 496. "The short quantity of the first syllable of $\theta\acute{\iota}\omega$, $\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega$, $\phi\acute{\iota}\omega$, and $\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$ reminds us that Homer . . . is thus less primitive than the Attic poets who preserve the original length of the syllable in question." Now $\theta\acute{\iota}\omega$ occurs only once in Homer, \circ 260, and $\theta\acute{\iota}\omega$ and $\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$ often. On the other hand, $\theta\acute{\iota}\omega$ occurs in Eur. El. 1141, Cycl. 334, $\theta\acute{\iota}\omega$ in Aesch. Sept. 535, 622, Soph. Frag. 757 (D. 824 N.), and $\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$ appears to be the only form in the tragic poets (Aesch. Ag. 259, 531, Sept. 77, Eur. Heraclid. 1013).

P. 500. "The digamma has been lost in the language of our Iliad and Odyssey in $\iota\omicron\nu$, a violet, and $\iota\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$." But on Mr. Sayce's principles (see his note on p. 498) $\iota\omicron\nu$ has the digamma in ϵ 72, and $\iota\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in δ 314.

P. 503. "The contracted form $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon$ betrays its more recent date." But it occurs in Archilochos, fr. 38 Bgk.

P. 503, N. 6. "Homer also offers us the Herodotean $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ (Z 35, I 85, K 56, Ω 566, \circ 231)." Two of these lines, the second and third, contain the form $\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omega\nu$, which may imply $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$ as well as $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$. The first and last contain $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ as a proper name. This leaves only Ω 566 with $\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ to prove a nom. $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ in the common noun.

P. 508. "The compound $\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \kappa\epsilon\nu$ is found once (N 127)." It is found also in ϵ 334, and three times (Δ 187, ϵ 361, ζ 259) with only $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ between the two words. The coincident use of the two words, which also Mr. Sayce regards as a remarkable feature of the language of Homer, is seen also in Archilochos, Alkman, and Tyrtaios, though they are not combined in one phrase.

P. 510. $\text{'}\acute{\omicron}\delta\upsilon\nu\sigma\eta\text{'}$ is quoted from τ 136 as "a genuine Atticism." But in fact it is there a conjecture of Porson's against the uniform text of the MSS., according to Bekker, La Roche, and Hayman. The only support for the conjecture is the mention of the form in the scholion on Δ 384, where the text has $\text{Τυδ}\acute{\omicron}\eta$.

P. 517. "Further proof of the artificial nature of the Homeric dialect is found in two facts. . . . The second fact is that short syllables are lengthened

... as in the first syllable of ἀθάνατος." This word is used with the same metrical value by Sappho, whose dialect is not usually thought artificial.

P. 520. "Among words found only in the Odyssey occur . . . ἀριθμός, εὐχή, κτήμα." But ἀριθμέω occurs in B 124, εὐχολή and κτήματα often in the Iliad.

P. 520. "The same word has different significations" in the two poems. "In the Iliad κλείς is a collar bone, . . . ὤτειλή a wound . . . ἐρις the battle-strife. In the Odyssey the same words mean key, scar, rivalry." In fact κλήις, besides meaning in both poems a bolt and a thole-pin, means collar bone only in the Iliad, tongue of a brooch once in the Odyssey, and key often in the Odyssey and once (Z 89) in the Iliad; ὤτειλή is always wound in both poems (κ 164, τ 456, ω 189; the word for scar, occurring only in the Odyssey, is οὐλή); ἐρις is conflict, quarrel in both poems, battle-strife in the Iliad, rivalry in the Odyssey and once (H 111) in the Iliad. "The accusative of ἐρις in the Odyssey is the analogic ἐριν of the Attic dialect." But ἐριδα also occurs twice in the Odyssey (ζ 92, θ 210).

P. 520. "By means of is represented by ἐκῆτι in the Iliad, by ἰότητι in the Odyssey." In fact, ἐκῆτι is used only in the Odyssey, ἰότητι in both poems.

P. 520. "It is perhaps of little moment that the later analogic comparative of φίλος, φίλτερος, is found only in the Iliad, φιλίων being alone employed in the Odyssey." φιλίων occurs twice in the Odyssey, and φίλτερος once (λ 360). φίλτατος, which implies φίλτερος, appears three times in the Odyssey.

P. 520. "We cannot overlook the significance of the fact that the contracted (sic) form of παρά, πάρ, occurs only before the letters γ, ζ, ξ, σ, and τ in the Iliad, and only before κ and μ in the Odyssey." It should be said that πάρ occurs before δ, λ, ν, and π in both poems, before γ, ζ, ξ, σ, and τ only in the Iliad, and before κ and μ only in the Odyssey, although the compounds παρκατέλεκτο, παρμέμβλωκε, παρμένετε occur in the Iliad.

Very probably more such errors might be found on a more careful examination, but this will do for a *Blumenlese*. Surely in an essay on minute points of language, designed to instruct a wide circle of students, such carelessness deserves censure. It makes a reader hesitate to receive any statement in the essay without verification. It will be observed that I have made no reference to any divergence in the opinions expressed in this essay from well-established doctrine, or to the method followed in the discussion.

LEWIS R. PACKARD.

ON THE DIPYLON VASES.

Sir: In my report (Vol. II, p. 258) of the Mittheilungen des deutschen archäologischen Institutes in Athen, in the abstract of Arthur Milchhöfer's *Gemalte Grabstelen*, is the following passage: "The absence of [funereal] monuments in the Vth century [B. C.] he explains thus: The mound, he thinks, was crowned by vases in the VIth century, the so-called Dipylon vases. These were succeeded by the black-figured *prothesis* amphoræ with funeral scenes," &c. I see that in condensing thirty-one pages into twenty-seven lines I have committed Milchhöfer to a date for the "Dipylon" vases when he had not expressed an opinion on that point, saying only that the black-figured *prothesis* vases were, so he conjectured, the direct successors

of the large "Dipylon" vases in the office of furnishing an apex for the burial-mound. Taking into consideration, however, the time when the black-figured style came into fashion, his words would imply that he placed the close of the "Dipylon" vases in the VIth century B. C. It may be well to group here the opinions on the period of this interesting class of early Greek pottery. A very fine specimen is in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the great vase of Curium in the Cesnola Collection (Cesnola's *Cyprus*, plate 29, p. 332). A large number are figured in the plates of Conze's *Zur Geschichte der Anfänge griechischer Kunst* (Vienna Academy *Sitzungsberichte*, Philos.-Hist. Classe, 1870). Others in *Monumenti dell' Instituto*, vol. 9, plates 39-40, and the *Annali*, 1872, plates I-K. The decoration (*i. e.* not including scenes with human figures) of the pottery called "Oriental," "Asiatic," "Corinthian," consists of animals, especially Asiatic carnivora, lion, tiger, panther; monsters of Asiatic fairy tales, crosses between bird, beast and man; arabesques from the vegetal world. This class of pottery has long been familiar to archaeologists, and its period is VII-VIth centuries B. C.

The other system of early Greek decoration, the "geometric," consists of short right lines arranged in various patterns; undulating lines, spirals, concentric rings; a few European animals; no vegetal arabesques, no savage beasts and monsters of Asiatic plains and imagination. The decoration of the "Dipylon" vases is a subdivision of the "geometric," adding to the above the special feature of concentric rings united into rows by oblique tangents. As a separate independent class of Greek pottery the "geometric" vases have been known hardly more than ten years. They were confounded with the very different "Corinthian" vases until Conze, in 1870, in the Vienna Academy's *Sitzungsberichte*, established them in their rights. He proved that they belonged to an entirely different system of decoration from the "Corinthian," "Asiatic," "Oriental," and finding this "geometric" decoration spread over primitive Europe (Germany, Britain, Italy), he pronounced it Indo-European. The "geometric" pottery of Greece he assigned to a day earlier than the time when Phoenicians and other Orientals came into contact with Greeks, namely, before the close of the second millennium B. C., acknowledging that many of the individual vases in our possession may well have been made after this contact. We may, therefore, take Conze's date, as stated by him in 1870, as about 1000 B. C. (Additional discussion by him in Vienna Academy's *Sitzungsberichte*, 1873.) Brunn, in his *Probleme in der Geschichte der Vasenmalerei* (Bavarian Academy's *Abhandl. Philos. Philol. Classe*, vol. 12, 1871, p. 107), declared in favor of Conze's views. G. Hirschfeld, in publishing, 1872, in the *Annali* and *Monumenti dell' Instituto* some freshly discovered vases dug up at the Dipylon Gate in Athens, gave in his adhesion to the views of Conze, but doubted the existing specimens being so old as the second millennium B. C., admitting, however, that undoubtedly a long interval intervened between the "Dipylon" and the "Corinthian" vases. It was the place of discovery of the large number of which Hirschfeld treated in the *Annali* that gave this class its present name of "Dipylon" pottery. Since 1872 the date has been

brought still further down. Within the last ten years our knowledge has been extended far back into pre-classic Greece by increased devotion to the historical method, by excavations in Mycenae, Olympia, the Aegean coast and islands, &c., by the presence of the German Archaeological Institute in Athens.

Furtwängler and Löschcke, who belong to the younger generation of German archaeologists, have done most within the last decade in establishing the development of early Greek decoration, as Milchhöfer in the early sculpture. The views of Furtwängler and Löschcke are as follows: (Furtwängler, *Bronzeperiode aus Olympia*, Berlin Academy's *Abhandlungen*, 1879, pp. 7-10, 27, 34, 43; Löschcke, *Annali dell' Istituto*, 1878, p. 306; Furtwängler, *Annali*, 1880, pp. 120, 121.) The usual view that the "geometric" decoration came first, then the "Oriental," is wrong. From the earliest times known to us down to the classic decoration with human figures and arabesques of lotos flower and palm leaf, both systems existed together, for in the oldest graves of Mycenae vases with merely vegetal decoration were found accompanied by others with "geometric" patterns. Thus the "Corinthian" was only a later stage of the Mycenaean, adding the wild beasts and monsters of Asia to the early use of vegetal ornament. Furtwängler showed that the "Dipylon" decoration was a subdivision of the "geometric"; that its home was on the Aegean islands and coast; that its characteristic feature is the rows of concentric rings united by tangents; that so far it has not been found west of Greece, neither in Italy nor in Northwestern Europe, and that even in Western Greece it is at present known only in very early remains lately dug up in Olympia and Dodona. As to the date of the "Dipylon" pottery, these archaeologists think it flourished in the VIIth century, and in its decline extended well into the VIth century B. C.

A. D. SAVAGE.

New York, February, 1882.

Sir: One word more on the Fragments of Sophocles, in reply to Mr. R. Ellis.

1. It is right that I should send a brief rejoinder to the acute and learned criticism with which Mr. Ellis has honoured me, if only to make the proper *amende* for having misapprehended his interpretation of Fr. 593.¹ Of course, as soon as my attention was recalled to the place, I understood Mr. Ellis's meaning perfectly, and I can only regret that I had not communicated with him in time to correct the error in my book. With regard to the interpretation, however, I must still think Mr. Ellis's view of the passage somewhat forced, both in respect of the language and the meaning. Mr. F. A. Paley, who agrees with me in joining ὑπο (*sic*) to ποταμίων ποτῶν, suggests *σταθεῖσα as a correction of ἴσταθεῖσα—an emendation which to my mind is perfectly convincing. 'And in the meadow, making a sudden stand, she all at once beholds her reflected image, where she is mirrored by the liquid stream.'

¹Amer. Jour. of Philol. Vol. II, p. 421.

2. On Fr. 86, Mr. Ellis thinks καὶ *τὰ πρόσικτα tautologous. I would reply that the distinction between 'the untrodden' and 'the unattainable' is sufficient for a poetical climax, and that although such pleonastic antitheses as πρὸς τε τὰ βατα καὶ πρὸς βέβηλα certainly occur, it would be strange to find the feeble and superfluous καὶ πρὸς βέβηλα at the beginning of an iambic line.

3. On Fr. 221, in advancing his own learned suggestion, Mr. Ellis passes over my conjectural emendation of l. 3, στέρημ' ἀνίας ἥδ' ἐν κοίμησίν τ' ἄσης, perhaps as too 'bold.'

I will only add that many of Mr. Ellis's remarks are well worthy of mature consideration, and I have no intention of dismissing them in these few hasty lines.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

MR. ELLIS ON THE FRAGMENTS OF SOPHOCLES.

Sir :—I have had a note from Professor Tyrrell of Dublin, in which he tells me that he has made the same emendation, Eur. fr. 1008 [Am. Jour. of Phil. Vol. II, p. 423], in *Hermathena* for 1875, p. 289, οἱ' for οἱ. I shall be much obliged if you would mention this in your next number.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

Trinity College, Oxford, April 30, 1882.

ERRATUM.

P. 83, l. 8 from top, for "often" read "offer."

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Allen (Grant). *Anglo-Saxon Britain*. New York, 1881. 12mo, 8+237 pp. Cloth, 75c.

Cicero (M. T.) *De Finibus bonorum et malorum, Libri V.* Ed. J. N. Madvigius. New York, 1882. 185 pp. Cl. 55c. Pap. 36c.

Crowell (E. P.) *Selections from Catullus, Lucretius, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid and Lucan.* (Latin text). Boston, 1882. 4+300 pp. D. cl. \$1.55.

Plutarch. *Life of Themistokles.* By Rev. Hubert A. Holden. *Macmillan*. New York, 1881. 16mo, 56+232 pp. Cloth, net, \$1.10.

BRITISH.

Aristotle on the Parts of Animals. Translated, etc., by W. Ogle. Roy. 8vo, 280 pp. 12s. 6d.

Browne (J. F.) *A Bangali Primer in Roman Characters.* London, 1881. 12mo. 2m. 40pf.

Chandler (Henry W.) *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation.* 2d ed., revised. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Dante's *Inferno*. Translated into Greek Verse by Musurus Pasha, D. C. L. 8vo., 347 pp. 12s.

Dutt (Toru). *Ancient Ballads and Legends of Hindustan.* With Introductory Memoir by E. W. Gosse. 12mo, 154 pp. 5s.

Fasnacht (G. Eugene). *The Organic Method of Studying Languages: French.* Post 8vo, 180 pp. 4s. 6d.

Genji Monogatari. (Japanese Romance). Translated by Suyematz Kenchio. Post 8vo, 256 pp. 7s. 6d.

Hicks (E. L.) *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions.* 8vo, 382 pp. 10s. 6d.

Homer's *Odyssey*. Edited, with Marginal References, Various Readings, Notes, Appendices, and 3 Facsimile Plates. By Henry Hayman. Vol. III. Books 13 to 24. 8vo, 740 pp. 24s.

— Rendered into English Verse by G. A. Schomberg. Books 13 to 14. 8vo, 354 pp. 12s.

Jackson (G. F.) *Shropshire Word Book.* London, 1881. 8vo, 614 pp. 37m.

Jäschke (H. A.) *A Tibetan-English Dictionary.* London, 1882. 8vo, xxiv, 672 pp. 30m.

Leicestershire Words, Phrases, and Proverbs. By A. B. and S. Evans. *Trübner*. 10s. 6d.

- Livy. Book II. Ed. by Henry Belcher. 12mo, 250 pp. 3s. 6d.
 Ovidii Nasonis Ibis ex Novis Codicibus Edidit, Scholia Vetera, Commentarium cum Prolegomenis Appendice Indice Addidit. R. Ellis. 8vo, 260 pp. 10s. 6d.
 Palmer (E. H.) Simplified Grammar of Hindustani, Persian, and Arabic. Post 8vo, 104 pp. 5s.
 Plato's Republic. Books I, II. By G. H. Wells. Post 8vo, 292 pp. 5s. 6d.
 Sophocles. By F. A. Paley. (Cambridge Greek and Latin Texts.) 18mo, 320 pp. 3s. 6d.
 The Names of Herbes. By William Turner (A. D. 1548). Edited by James Britten, F. L. S. 6s.
 Theal (G. McCall). Kaffir Folk-Lore. London, 1882. 8vo, 222 pp. 9s.
 Vinaya (The) Pitakam. Vol. V. Suttavi-Changa II. 8vo. 21s.
 Virgil's Æneid. Book IV. Edited by E. Sidgwick. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo, 72 pp. 1s. 6d.
 Wilton (Rev. C. T.) An Outline Grammar of the Luganda Language. Fcap 8vo. S. P. C. K. 3s.
 Wollaston (A. N.) An English-Persian Dictionary. 8vo, 472 pp. 21s.

FRENCH.

- Alart (B. J.) Documents sur la langue catalane des anciens comtés de Roussillon et de Cerdagne. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 6 fr.
 Barbier de Meynard (A. C.) Dictionnaire turc-français. Tome I. 2 livraisons. Gr. in-8. *E. Leroux*. 10 fr.
 Borel. Dictionnaire des termes du vieux français, ou Trésor des recherches et antiquités gauloises et françaises. Nouvelle édition par L. Favre. 2 vol. in-8. *Champion*. 15 fr.
 Brevaux (J.), Sagot (P.) et Adam (L.) Grammaires et vocabulaires Roucouyenne, Arrouague, Piapoco et d'autres langues de la région des Guyanes. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 25 fr.
 David. Grammaire de la langue araméenne selon les deux dialectes syriaque et chaldaïque. Paris, 1882. 8vo. 12 fr.
 D'Herbomez (A.) Etude sur le dialecte du Tournaisis au XIII siècle, d'après les chartes de Tournai. 1882. 8vo, 160 pages. 4 fr.
 Godefroy (Fr.) Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française. Fasc. 12. Paris, 1882. 4to. Vol. II., p. 81-160. 5 fr.
 Gras (Felix). Toloza, geste provençale. Avec la traduction française littéraire. In-12. *Fischbacher*. 4 fr.
 Luchaire (Achille). Recueil de textes de l'ancien dialecte gascon. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 6 fr.
 Ravier (H.) Dictionarium latino-anamiticum completum et novo ordine dispositum cui accedit appendix. In-4. (Ninh Phu.) *Challamel*. 75 fr.
 Senart (E.) Le Mahāvastu. Texte sanscrit, publié pour la première fois et accompagné d'introductions et d'un commentaire par E. Senart. Tome I. Gr. in-8. (Imprimerie nationale). *Leroux*. 30 fr.

GERMAN.

Aristophanis comoediae. Annotatione critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis graecis instruxit Frdr. H. M. Blaydes. Pars 4. Aves. (xx, 510 S.) Halle. *Buchh. d. Waisenh.* n. 10. (I-IV. n. 25.)

Aristotelis politicorum liber I, ex rec. Mor. Schmidt. 4. (21 S.) Jena, *E. Frommann'sche Buchdr.* baar n. —50.

Baragiola (A.) Das Hildebrandslied. Versione dall' antico tedesco. Strassburg, 1882. *Trübner.* 8vo, 19 pp. 1m.

Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen. Herausg. von Adb. Bezzenberger. VII Bd. Göttingen, 1881. *Peppmüller.* 8vo, 1 Hft., 104 pp. 10m.

Bibliothek, assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. I. 4 Lfg. gr. 4. Leipzig. *Hinrichs' Verl.* n. 14. (1-4. n. 36.) Inhalt: Akkadische u. sumerische Keilschrifttexte, nach den Originalen im Brit. Museum copirt u. m. einleit. Zusammenstellgn. sowie erklär. Anmerkgn. hrsg. v. Privatdoc. Dr. Paul Haupt. 4 Lfg. Erklärende Anmerkgn. [1. Grundzüge der akkad. Grammatik. 2. Kurzes akkad. Glossar. 3. Anmerkungen zur Schrifttafel. 4. Belegstellen zur Zeichen-sammlg.] (S. 133-220.)

Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken, bearb. v. F. Bücheler, B. Delbrück, K. Foy, etc. 4 Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig. *Breitkopf & Härtel.* n. 4. Inhalt: Introduction to the study of language: a critical survey of the history and methods of comparative philology of the indo-european languages. By B. Delbrück. Authorised translation, with a preface by the author. (xiv, 142 S.)

Birt (Thdr.) Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur. Mit Beiträgen zur Textgeschichte d. Theokrit, Catull, Properz u. anderer Autoren. gr. 8. (vii, 518 S.) Berlin. *Hertz.* n. 12.

Bloomfield (M.) Das Gr̥hyasamgrahapariṣiṣṭa d. Gobhila-putra. [Aus: "Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch."] gr. 8. (55 S.) Leipzig. *Matthes.* baar n. 1.20.

Brassai (S.) Die Reform des Sprachunterrichts in Europa. Ein Beitrag zur Sprachwissenschaft. 12. (100 S.) Klausenburg. baar n. 1.20; geb. n.n. 1.50.

Braune (Thdr.) Observationes grammaticae et criticae ad usum ita, sic, tam [tamen], adeo particularum Plautinum ac Terentianum spectantes. gr. 8. (63 S.) Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 160.

Busch (Hg.) Die ursprünglichen Lieder vom Ende der Nibelungen. Ein Beitrag zur Nibelungenfrage. Halle, 1882. *Niemeyer.* 8vo, 73 pp. 1m. 8opf.

Çāgvata's Anakārthasamuccaya, c. homonym. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch. Hrsg. v. Thdr. Zachariae. gr. 8. (xxxiv, 108 S.) Berlin. *Weidmann.* n. 7.

Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum bibliothecae regiae Monacensis. Tomi IV, pars 4. gr. 8. München. n.n. 6. (I, 1-4; III, 1-3; IV-VIII, 1. n.n. 83.90). Inhalt: Catalogus codicum latinorum bibliothecae regiae Monacensis. Secundum Andreae Schmelleri indices composuerunt Carl

Halm et Guil. Meyer. Tomi II, pars 4. Codicis num. 21406-27268 complectens. (299 S.)

Catonis (M. Porci). De agri cultura liber, M. Terenti Varronis rerum rusticarum libri tres, ex recensione Henr. Keilii. Vol. I. Fasc. 1. gr. 8. (109 S.) Leipzig. n. 240.

Corani textus arabicus. Ed. ster. C. Tauchnitzii tertium emendata. Nova impressio. 4. (x, 341 S.) Leipzig, 1881, cart. n. 20.

Culmann (F. W.) Etymologische Aufsätze u. Gundsätze. III u. IV. gr. 8. Strassburg. Schmidt. n. 3.90 (I-IV, n. 7.50.) Inhalt: III. Umschau auf dem Gebiete der Vogelwelt u. der Wurzel *va* f. Liebhaber der Sprachforschung. (106 S.) 1879. n. 1.90. IV. Umschau auf dem Gebiete der griech. u. latein. Grammatik. Ein Beitrag zur Aufklärg. grammat. Geheimnisse. (94 S.) n. 2.

Deecke (W.) u. Pauli (C.) Etruskische Forschungen u. Studien. 2 Hft. (Der etrusk. Forschgn. 5 Hft.; der beiden Sammlgn. 9 Hft.) gr. 8. Stuttgart. Heitz. n. 6. (I u. 2, n. 11). Inhalt: I. Der Dativ *larθiale* u. die Stammerweiterung auf *-ali* (die etrusk. Sprache indogermanisch-italisch). II. Nachtrag zum *templum* v. Piacenza (die Leber e. *templum*). Von W. Deecke. Mit 6 (lith.) Taf. (v, 97 S.)

Deneken (Frdr.) De Theoxeniis. Diss. Addita est tab. (photo-lith.) gr. 8. (56 S.) Berlin, 1881. baar n. 2.

Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses selectae. Vol. V. gr. 8. (iii, 365 S.) Strassburg, 1881. n. 6 (I-V, n. 32.)

Ewald (L.) Grammatik der T'ai-Sprache. Leipzig, 1881. 8vo. VIII 111 pp. 9m.

Eyssenhardt (Frz.) Roemisch u. Romanisch. gr. 8. (xi, 205 S.) Berlin. n. 3.60.

Fabricius (Ernst). De architectura graeca commentationes epigraphicae. Adjecta est tabula (lith.) gr. 8. (iii, 86 S.) Berlin, 1881. n. 2.40.

Gazaei (Joa.) Descriptio tabulae mundi et Anacreontea. Rec. Eug. Abel. gr. 8. (87 S.) Berlin. n. 2.40.

Hartmann (O. E.) Der römische Kalender. Aus dem Nachlasse d. Verf. hrsg. v. Ludw. Lange. gr. 8. (xxxi, 266 S.) Leipzig. n. 8.

Hesychii Milesii quae supersunt, cum proleg. ed. Joa. Flach. Cod. A. gr. 8. (lxxii, 263 S.) Leipzig. Teubner. n. 9.

Horatius Flaccus (Q.) Rec. atque interpretatus est J. G. Orellius. Ed. minorem sextam cur. H. Hirschfelder. Vol. I. 8. (vi, 194 S.) Berlin. Calvary & Company. n. 2.25.

Jäschke (H. A.) Handwörterbuch der Tibetischen Sprache. 4. (xxvi, 671 autogr. S.) Gnadau, 1871. n. 22.

Inscriptiones graecae antiquissimae praeter Atticas in Attica repertas consilio et auctoritate Academiae litterarum regiae Borussicae ed. Herm. Roehl. Fol. (v, 193 S. m. eingedr. Fig.) Berlin. n. 16.

Kolster (W. H.) Vergil's Eklogen, in ihrer strophischen Gliederung nachgewiesen. gr. 8. (xiii, 226 S.) Leipzig. n. 4.80.

Lauth (Frz. Jos.) Die ägyptische Chronologie gegenüber der historischen Kritik d. Hrn. A. v. Gutschmid. gr. 8. (lxxxiv u. S. 269-326). München. baar n. 6.

Loth (O.) Üb. Leben u. Werke d. Abdallah ibn ul Mutazz. gr. 8. (vi, 75 S.) Leipzig. n. 8.

Lycophronis Alexandra rec. Ed. Scheer. Vol. I. Alexandra cum paraphrasibus ad codicum fidem recensita et emendata, indices subjecti. gr. 8. (xxxii, 148 S.) Berlin, 1881. n. 5.

Meltzl v. Lomnitz (Hugo). Die Minckwitzische Ode, ihr Epitheton ornans u. Neologismus. 21 Jan., 1882. kl. 4. (16 S.) Klausenburg. baar n. 1.20.

Miklosich (Fr.) Rumunische Untersuchungen. 1. Istro- und macedorumunische Sprachdenkmäler. 2. Abth. Aus "Denkschriften der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften." Wien, 1882. 4to, 94 pp. 4m.

Minor (J.) Die Leiche und Lieder Ulrichs v. Winterstetten, herausgegeben. Wien, 1882. 8vo. (xxiv, 67 pp.) 3m.

Mnemosyne. Bibliotheca philologica Batava. Scripserunt C. G. Cobet, C. M. Francken, H. van Herwerden, etc., collegerunt C. G. Cobet, H. W. van der Mey. Nova series. Vol. X. 4 partes. gr. 8. (1 Hft., 112 S.) Leipzig. Harrassowitz. baar n.n. 9.

Müller (Joh.) Emendationen zur Naturalis Historia des Plinius. V. Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss." Lex.-8. (26 S.) Wien. Gerold's Sohn in Comm. n. —40. (I-V: n.n. 2.50.)

Nietzki (Max). De Thucydideae elocutionis proprietate quadam. Diss. gr. 8. (68 S.) Königsberg, 1881. baar n. 1.50.

Oeri (J. J.) Beiträge zum Verständniss der Trachinierinnen d. Sophokles. gr. 8. (68 S.) Berlin. Weidmann. n. 2.

Plauti (T. M.) Menaechmi, in usum lectionum suarum ed. J. Vahlen. gr. 8. (iv, 99 S.) Berlin. n. 2.

Platonis opera omnia, rec., prolegomenis et commentariis instruxit Gfr. Stallbaum. Vol. II, Sect. II, continens Protagoram. Ed. IV emendatior, ed. J. S. Kroschel. gr. 8. (viii, 211 S.) Leipzig. 2.40.

Poetae lyrici graeci. Rec. Thdr. Bergk. Ed. IV. Vol. II, poetas elegiacos et jambographos continens. gr. 8. (iv, 522 S.) Leipzig. Teubner. n. 10.

Pökel (W.) Philologisches Schriftsteller-Lexikon. 2 Lfg. Leipzig, 1881. 8vo, pp. 65-128. 1m.

Richter (Rich.) Catulliana. 4. (26 S.) baar n. 1.20.

Rothe (F. F.) Griechische Denksprüche in Vers u. Prosa. gr. 8. (xi, 130 u. Wörterverz. 95 S.) Magdeburg, 1882. n. 2.

Saalfeld (G. A.) Italograeca. 1 Hft.: Vom ältesten Verkehr zwischen Hellas u. Rom bis zur Kaiserzeit. gr. 8. (49 S.) Hannover. Hahn. n. 1.

Schenkl (Heinr.) Plautinische Studien. Aus: Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss. Lex.-8. (92 S.) Wien. n. 1.40.

Schmitz (Dr. M.) Quellenkunde der römischen Geschichte bis auf Paulus Diaconus. gr. 8. (128 S.) Gütersloh, 1881. Bertelsmann. n. 2.

Spiegel (Fr.) Vergleichende Grammatik der altéränischen Sprachen. gr. 8. (iv, 559 S.) Leipzig. Engelmann. n. 14.

Steinmeyer u. Sievers. Die althochdeutschen Glossen, gesammelt u. bearb. 2 Bd. Glossen zu nichtbibl. Schriften, bearb. v. E. Steinmeyer. Lex.-8. (xii, 778 S.) Berlin. n. 20.

Thielmann (Phpp.) Das Verbum *dare* im Lateinischen als Repräsentant der indoeuropäischen Wurzel *dha*. gr. 8. (viii, 134 S.) Leipzig. Teubner. n. 2.40.

Trumpp (Ernst). Der Bedingungssatz im Arabischen. Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. k. b. Akad. d. Wiss." gr. 8. (112 S.) München. baar n. 3.50.

— Das Hexaëmeron d. Pseudo-Epiphanius. Aethiopischer Text, verglichen m. dem arab. Orig.-Text u. deutscher Uebersetzg. Aus: "Abhandlgn. d. k. b. Akad. d. Wiss." gr. 4. (vi, 88 S.) Ebd. baar n. 5.50.

Übersicht, bibliographische, üb. die die griechischen u. lateinischen Autoren betreffende Litteratur der J. 1867–1876. Aus: "Philologus." 2 Abth. Lateinische Autoren. 2 Hft. Idacius—Vulcatius. gr. 8. (S. 217–495.) Göttingen, 1881. Dieterich's Verl. (à) n. 4. (I u. II, n. 16.)

Wachsmuth (Curt.) Studien zu den griechischen Florilegien. Lex.-8. (iii, 219 S.) Berlin. Weidmann. n. 12.

Wieseler (Frdr.) Schedae criticae in Aristophanis Aves. 4. (15 S.) Göttingen. Dieterich's Verl. baar n. —80.

Windel (Joa.) De oratione quae est inter Demosthenicas XVII et inscribitur: *περὶ τῶν πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον συνθηκῶν*. Diss. gr. 4. (40 S.) Lipsiae, 1881. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.) baar n. 2.

Wülcker (Rch. P.) Kleinere angelsächsische Dichtungen. Halle, 1882. 4to. IV, 169 pp. 3m. 60 pf.

Zeuner (Rud.) Die Sprache d. Kentischen Psalters. gr. 8. (142 S.) Halle, 1881. n. 4.

Zierner (Hm.) Junggrammatische Streifzüge im Gebiete der Syntax. Colberg, 1882. Post 8vo. viii, 156 pp. 2m 70 pf.

ITALIAN.

Fioretto (Gi.) Gli umanisti. Verona, 1881. 16mo, 170 pp. 3 l.

Forcellini (Aegid.) Totius latinitatis lexicon. Pars altera sive onomasticon totius latinitatis, opera et studio Dr. Vinc. De-Vit lucubratum. Distr. 19. gr. 4. (2 Bd. S. 657–736.) Prati. (à) n. 2.50.

Ognibene (Andr.) Florilegio filologico. Vol. I. Napoli, 1881. 16mo, 73 pp. 3 l.

Tartara (Alex.) Animadversiones in locos nonnullos Valeri Catulli et Titi Livi. Itum emendatiores editae. gr. 8. (102 S.) Rom. Loescher & Co. n. 2.

SPANISH.

Monlau (P. F.) Diccionario etimológico de la lengua castellana. Segunda edicion. Madrid, 1882. 4to, 1168 pp. 40 l.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

American College Directory and Universal Catalogue. Vol. IV. St. Louis, Mo.: *C. H. Evans & Co.* 1882.

Blaydes (F. H. M.) Aristophanis Aves. Annotat. Critica, commentario exegetico et scholiis Graecis instruit. Halis Saxonum: In Orphanotrophei Libraria. 1882. 10 M.

Bréal (M.) et Bailly (A.) Les Mots Latins groupés d'après le sens et l'étymologie. 1. Cours Élémentaire. 2. Cours Intermédiaire. Paris: *Hachette et Cie.* 1882.

Bréal (M.) Excursions Pédagogiques. Paris: *Hachette et Cie.* 1882.

Brinton (D. G.) Prophetic and Historic Records of the Mayas of Yucatan. Philadelphia: *E. Stern & Co.* 1882.

ΔΕΦΝΕΡ (M.): περὶ τῆς ἀξίας τοῦ πυροβολικοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος. ἐν Ἀθήναις. ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου τοῦ Κάλλους. 1882.

Friderici (C.) Bibliotheca Orientalis. Leipzig: *O. Schulze.* London: *Trübner & Co.* 1881.

Halsey (C. S.) An Etymology of Latin and Greek. Boston: *Ginn, Heath & Co.* 1882.

Hayman (H.) Homer's Odyssey. Edited with marginal references, various readings, notes, appendices, and three facsimile plates. Vol. III. Books XIII-XXIV. London: *David Nutt.* 1882.

Hudson (H. N.) Discourse delivered on the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Daniel Webster, Jan. 18, 1882. Boston: *Ginn & Heath.* 1882.

v. Lomnitz (Prof. Dr. Hugo Melzel). Die Minckwitzische Ode. Ihr Epitheton ornans u. Neologismus. Klausenburg, 1882. London: *Trübner & Co.* 1882. (Only 70 copies printed.)

ΜΟΣΧΟΒΑΚΗΣ (N. Γ.): τὸ ἐν Ἑλλάδι δημόσιον δίκαιον ἐπὶ Τουρκοκρατίας. Διατριβὴ ἐπὶ ἐφημερίᾳ. ἐν Ἀθήναις. 1882.

New Sight Test for Schools. Boston: *Ginn, Heath & Co.* 1882. 15c.

Schipper (J.) Englische Metrik in historischer u. systematischer Entwicklung dargestellt. Erster Theil. Altenglische Metrik. Bonn: *Emil Strauss.* 1882.

Seuffert (B.) Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale der 18 Jahrh. in Neudrucken Faust: ein Fragment von Goethe. Heilbronn: *Gebr. Henninger.* 1882. 70 pf.

Seymour (T. D.) Selected Odes of Pindar. 252 pp. Boston: *Ginn, Heath & Co.* 1882.

From Messrs. Macmillan & Co., New York, through Messrs. Cushings & Bailey, Baltimore:

Cluer (A. R.) Livy: Books V, VI and VII. Oxford: *Cl. Pr. Series.* 1881. 90c.

Elementary Classics:

Page (T. E.) Horace Odes III. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 1882. 40c.

Skrine (J. H.) Vergil Georgics II. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 1882. 40c.

Green (W. C.) Aristophanes' Plutus. Cambridge: *Pitt Press Ser.* 1882. 90c.

Hicks (E. L.) Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions. Oxford: *Clarendon Press.* 1882. \$2.75.

Hailstone (H.) Homer, Iliad Book VI. Oxford: *Cl. Pr. Series.* 1882. 40c.

Howson (E. W.) Vergil, Aeneid II and III. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 75c.

Holden (H. A.) Plutarch's Themistokles. London: *Macmillan & Co.* \$1.10.

Jerram (C. S.) Euripides, Helena. Oxford: *Cl. Pr. Series.* 1882. 40c.

Peskett (A. G.) Caesaris de Bello Gallico Commentarius Tertius. Cambridge: *Pitt Press Series.* 1882. 40c.

Wostenholme (H. J.) Uhland's Ernst, Herzog v. Schwaben. Cambridge: *Pitt Press Series.* 1882. 90c.

EDITORIAL NOTE.

The life of a periodical that addresses itself to a limited range of readers is so precarious that the editor may congratulate the friends of this enterprise on the beginning of another volume. It is true that the support accorded to the Journal by the philological public of America is far from being adequate to the realization of the original plan, but even with the present subscription list it will be possible to maintain the Journal for the current year at the measure of usefulness that it has already reached. Thanks to the philological activity of the contributors, there is no danger of any lack of material, and there is no reason to fear that the Journal will not serve a good purpose as a vehicle of communication among American scholars. A wider circulation would enable the management to improve many details of the work, and every effort on the part of the friends of the Journal to extend its usefulness will be met by a corresponding effort on the part of the editor to make it more worthy of its name.

The special thanks of the editor are due to those self-sacrificing scholars who have so faithfully performed the onerous task of preparing the "Reports" of the foreign periodicals. As the Journal undertakes to cover the whole philological ground, it has not been an easy work, indeed, it has sometimes been impossible, to present in each number a table of contents that would have at least some especial attraction for every subscriber, and in this effort to hold the balance among the different departments, the reporters have been of the greatest service. The editor is happy to announce that not one of the honored scholars, who have given him such efficient aid, has shown the slightest symptom of growing weary in the good work.

In the matter of reviews the space is so limited and the help so inadequate that many important works have been passed by without notice, or the notice deferred until the interest has in a measure ceased. As nothing seems to be more needed in American philology than impartial and competent criticism, it is much to be desired that this department of the Journal should assume its proper proportion, and it is hoped that in future a more active coöperation will be secured.

The price of the back-numbers of the Journal has been reduced to \$2 a volume.